

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE DUFFEY, OF OHIO

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 26

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
January 5, 1937.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. WARREN J. DUFFEY, a Representative from the State of Ohio.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect this House do now adjourn.

Mr. BULKLEY. Mr. President, I send resolutions to the desk, which I ask to have read and considered at this time.

The resolutions (S. Res. 31) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Senate Resolution 31

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. WARREN J. DUFFEY, late a Representative from the State of Ohio.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE CARY, OF KENTUCKY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 27

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. GLOVER H. CARY, a Representative from the State of Kentucky.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect this House do now adjourn.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask to have considered at this time.

The resolutions (S. Res. 32) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Senate Resolution 32

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. GLOVER H. CARY, late a Representative from the State of Kentucky.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE GREGORY, OF KENTUCKY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 28

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
January 5, 1937.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. WILLIAM V. GREGORY, a Representative from the State of Kentucky.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect this House do now adjourn.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk resolutions, which I ask to have considered at this time.

The resolutions (S. Res. 33) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Senate Resolution 33

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. WILLIAM V. GREGORY, late a Representative from the State of Kentucky.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE JACOBSEN, OF IOWA

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 23

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
January 5, 1937.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. BERNHARD M. JACOBSEN, a Representative from the State of Iowa.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect this House do now adjourn.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask for immediate consideration of the resolutions which I send to the desk.

The resolutions (S. Res. 34) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Senate Resolution 34

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. BERNHARD M. JACOBSEN, late a Representative from the State of Iowa.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE M'SWAIN, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 29

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
January 5, 1937.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JOHN J. McSWAIN, a Representative from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect this House do now adjourn.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I send resolutions to the desk which I ask to have read and considered at this time.

The resolution (S. Res. 35) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Senate Resolution 35

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JOHN J. McSWAIN, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Members of the House of Representatives whose deaths have been announced, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, January 8, 1937, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 6, 1937

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, unto whom all hearts are open and all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid, cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy holy spirit, that we may perfectly love Thee and worthily magnify Thy holy name. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 38) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 38

Whereas ANDREW J. MONTAGUE, a Representative from the State of Virginia, from the third district thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Speaker, or a deputy named by him, be, and he is hereby, authorized to administer the oath of office to said ANDREW J. MONTAGUE at Urbanna, in the State of Virginia, and that the said oath when administered as herein authorized shall be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said ANDREW J. MONTAGUE.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 39) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 39

Whereas PHILIP ARNOLD GOODWIN, a Representative from the State of New York, from the Twenty-seventh District thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Speaker, or a deputy named by him, be, and he is hereby, authorized to administer the oath of office to said PHILIP ARNOLD GOODWIN at Cocksackie, in the State of New York, and that the said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said PHILIP ARNOLD GOODWIN.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I present a resolution (H. Res. 40) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 40

Whereas HENRY E. STUBBS, a Representative from the State of California, from the Tenth District thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Speaker, or a deputy named by him, be, and he is hereby, authorized to administer the oath of office to said HENRY E. STUBBS at Walter Reed General Hospital, in the District of Columbia, and that the said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said HENRY E. STUBBS.

The resolution was agreed to.

ELECTION OF MINORITY MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 41) providing for the election of certain minority Members to certain committees to which the majority Members were elected on yesterday.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 41

Resolved, That the minority Members now on the following committees be, and they are hereby, elected minority Members on said committees, to wit:

Ways and Means: ALLEN T. TREADWAY, of Massachusetts; FRANK CROWTHER, of New York; HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota; DANIEL A. REED, of New York; ROY O. WOODRUFF, of Michigan; and THOMAS A. JENKINS, of Ohio.

Appropriations: JOHN TABER, of New York; ROBERT L. BACON, of New York; RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, of Massachusetts; LLOYD THURSTON, of Iowa; W. P. LAMBERTSON, of Kansas; D. LANE POWERS, of New Jersey; and J. WILLIAM DITTER, of Pennsylvania.

Foreign Affairs: HAMILTON FISH, Jr., of New York; JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts; CHARLES A. EATON, of New Jersey; GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM, of Massachusetts; LEO E. ALLEN, of Illinois; and EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts.

Rules: JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts; and CARL E. MAPES, of Michigan.

Mr. BOILEAU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York whether or not those Members placed on committees are the same Members who served on those committees last session?

Mr. SNELL. That is correct.

Mr. BOILEAU. I call attention to the fact at this time that the Farmer-Labor-Progressive Members of the House as yet have not had an understanding as to their committee assignments, and I wanted to bring that to the attention of the House at this time.

Mr. SNELL. As far as I am concerned, I have never had anything to do with your assignments. That is a matter that the majority must take up.

Mr. BOILEAU. I appreciate that fact, but I wanted to know whether or not vacancies on those committees had been filled by minority Members?

Mr. SNELL. The selections today are Republican Members who were members of those same committees last session.

Mr. BOILEAU. I have no objection to that.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ELECTION OF MAJORITY MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 42) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 42

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing committees of the House of Representatives, as follows:

Ways and Means: OTHA D. WEARIN, Iowa.
Accounts: LINDSAY C. WARREN, chairman, North Carolina; JOHN J. COCHRAN, Missouri; CHARLES KRAMER, California; JOE STARNES, Alabama; NAT PATTON, Texas; AARON LANE FORD, Mississippi.

The resolution was agreed to.

RESIGNATIONS OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications:

CHEROKEE, IOWA, November 28, 1936.

HON. WILLIAM BANKHEAD,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as Representative from the Ninth Congressional District of Iowa in the United States Congress because of my election to fill the unexpired portion of the senatorial term of the Honorable Louis Murphy, deceased.

This resignation is to be effective retroactively to November 4, 1936.

Respectfully submitted.

GUY M. GILLETTE.

JUNE 25, 1936.

HON. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the Governor of Washington my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Fifth Congressional District of Washington.

With highest respects, I am,
Sincerely yours,

SAM B. HILL.

(Telegram)

DETROIT, MICH., November 18, 1936.

HON. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

With a tinge of regret I submit to you my resignation as a Member of the House because I have enjoyed my association with you and the Members. I have accepted the appointment by the Governor of Michigan to the Senate, effective November 19.

Sincerely and respectfully,

PRENTISS M. BROWN.

CONSERVATION OF WILDLIFE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the report of the special committee to investigate all matters pertaining to the replacement and conservation of wildlife, made pursuant to House Resolution 44, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION

The SPEAKER, pursuant to the provisions of title 40, sections 175 and 176, United States Code, announced the appointment of Mr. O'CONNOR [New York], and Mr. HANCOCK [New York], members of the House Office Building Commission to serve with himself.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, certain Members-elect who were not sworn in yesterday are present today and wish to take the oath of office.

Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MURDOCK of Utah, Mr. BOYKIN, Mr. McGRANERY, and Mr. SACKS took the oath of office.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an address delivered by myself at the dedication of the Bronx post office in the city of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

RECESS

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12:58 p. m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, its Chief Clerk, announced that in accordance with the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, agreed to January 5, 1937, the Vice President appointed Mr. GEORGE and Mr. AUSTIN tellers on the part of the Senate to count the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States.

COUNTING THE ELECTORAL VOTE

At 1 o'clock p. m. the Doorkeeper, Mr. Joseph J. Sinnott, announced the Vice President of the United States and the Senate of the United States.

The Senate entered the Hall, headed by the Vice President of the United States and the Secretary of the Senate, the Members and officers of the House rising to receive them.

The Vice President took his seat as the presiding officer of the joint convention of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House occupying the chair to his left.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the Congress, the Senate and House of Representatives pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws of the United States have met in joint session for the purpose of opening the certificates and ascertaining and counting the votes of the electors of the several States for President and Vice President. Under well-established precedents, unless a motion shall be made in any case, the reading of the formal portions of the certificates will be dispensed with. After ascertainment has been had that the certificates are authentic and correct in form, the tellers will count and make a list of the votes cast by the electors of the several States.

The tellers heretofore appointed will take their places at the desk.

The tellers, Mr. GEORGE and Mr. AUSTIN on the part of the Senate, and Mr. FLETCHER and Mr. TINKHAM on the part of the House took their places at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hands to the tellers the certificates of the electors for President and Vice President of the State of Alabama, and they will count and make a list of the votes cast by that State.

Mr. GEORGE (one of the tellers). Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Alabama seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that Franklin Delano Roosevelt, of the State of New York, received 11 votes for President, and John Nance Garner, of the State of Texas, received 11 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the Chair will omit in the further procedure the formal statement just made, and will open in alphabetical order and pass to the tellers the certificates showing the votes of the electors in each State; and the tellers will read, count, and announce the result in each State, as was done with respect to the State of Alabama.

There was no objection.

The tellers then proceeded to read, count, and announce, as was done in the case of Alabama, the electoral votes of the several States in alphabetical order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Gentlemen of the Congress, the certificates of all States have now been opened and read,

and the tellers will make final ascertainment of the result and deliver the same to the Vice President.

The tellers delivered to the Vice President the following statement of the result:

The undersigned, WALTER F. GEORGE and WARREN R. AUSTIN, tellers on the part of the Senate, BROOKS FLETCHER and GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM, tellers on the part of the House of Representatives, report the following as the result of the ascertainment and counting of the electoral vote for President and Vice President of the United States for the term beginning on the 20th day of January 1937:

Electoral votes of each State	State	For President		For Vice President	
		Franklin D. Roosevelt, of New York	Alfred M. Landon, of Kansas	John N. Garner, of Texas	Frank Knox, of Illinois
11	Alabama	11		11	
3	Arizona	3		3	
9	Arkansas	9		9	
22	California	22		22	
6	Colorado	6		6	
8	Connecticut	8		8	
3	Delaware	3		3	
7	Florida	7		7	
12	Georgia	12		12	
4	Idaho	4		4	
29	Illinois	29		29	
14	Indiana	14		14	
11	Iowa	11		11	
9	Kansas	9		9	
11	Kentucky	11		11	
10	Louisiana	10		10	
5	Maine		5		5
8	Maryland	8		8	
17	Massachusetts	17		17	
19	Michigan	19		19	
11	Minnesota	11		11	
9	Mississippi	9		9	
15	Missouri	15		15	
4	Montana	4		4	
7	Nebraska	7		7	
3	Nevada	3		3	
4	New Hampshire	4		4	
16	New Jersey	16		16	
3	New Mexico	3		3	
47	New York	47		47	
13	North Carolina	13		13	
4	North Dakota	4		4	
26	Ohio	26		26	
11	Oklahoma	11		11	
5	Oregon	5		5	
36	Pennsylvania	36		36	
4	Rhode Island	4		4	
8	South Carolina	8		8	
4	South Dakota	4		4	
11	Tennessee	11		11	
23	Texas	23		23	
4	Utah	4		4	
3	Vermont		3		3
11	Virginia	11		11	
8	Washington	8		8	
8	West Virginia	8		8	
12	Wisconsin	12		12	
3	Wyoming	3		3	
531		523	8	523	8

WALTER F. GEORGE,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
Tellers on the part of the Senate.

BROOKS FLETCHER,
GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM,
Tellers on the part of the House of Representatives.

The state of the vote for President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of electors appointed to vote for President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, of the State of New York, has received for President of the United States 523 votes.

Alfred M. Landon, of the State of Kansas, has received 8 votes.

The state of the vote for Vice President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for Vice President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

John N. Garner, of the State of Texas, has received for Vice President of the United States 523 votes.

Frank Knox, of the State of Illinois, has received 8 votes.

This announcement of the state of the vote by the President of the Senate shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons elected President and Vice President of the United States, each for the term beginning on the 20th day of January 1937, and shall be entered, together with a list of the votes, on the Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Gentlemen of the Congress, the purposes for which the joint convention of the two Houses of Congress has been called having been accomplished, I declare it dissolved.

The Senate will stand in recess until 2 o'clock p. m.

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess until 2 o'clock p. m.

Thereupon (at 1:30 o'clock p. m.) the Senate and House stood in recess until 2 o'clock p. m.

The joint meeting of the two Houses was called to order by the Speaker at 1:57 p. m.

At 1 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper, Mr. Joseph J. Sinnott, announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The Members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Chamber and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The SPEAKER. On behalf of the House, the Chair appoints the following committee to conduct the President into the Chamber: Mr. RAYBURN, Mr. DOUGHTON, and Mr. SNELL.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate the Chair appoints as a like committee Senator ROBINSON, Senator PITTMAN, and Senator McNARY.

At 2 o'clock p. m. the President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House and stood at the Clerk's desk amid prolonged applause.

The SPEAKER. Senators and Representatives of the Seventy-fifth Congress, I have the distinguished honor of presenting the President of the United States. [Applause.]

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The President of the United States:

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the Congress of the United States:

For the first time in our national history a President delivers his annual message to a new Congress within a fortnight of the expiration of his term of office. While there is no change in the Presidency this year, change will occur in future years. It is my belief that under this new constitutional practice the President should in every fourth year, insofar as seems reasonable, review the existing state of our national affairs and outline broad future problems, leaving specific recommendations for future legislation to be made by the President about to be inaugurated.

At this time, however, circumstances of the moment compel me to ask your immediate consideration of: First, measures extending the life of certain authorizations and powers which, under present statutes, expire within a few weeks; second, an addition to the existing Neutrality Act to cover specific points raised by the unfortunate civil strife in Spain; and, third, a deficiency appropriation bill for which I shall submit estimates this week.

In March 1933 the problems which faced our Nation and which only our National Government had the resources to meet, were more serious even than appeared on the surface.

It was not only that the visible mechanism of economic life had broken down. More disturbing was the fact that long neglect of the needs of the underprivileged had brought too many of our people to the verge of doubt as to the successful adaptation of our historic traditions to the complex modern world. In that, lay a challenge to our democratic form of government itself.

Ours was the task to prove that democracy could be made to function in the world of today as effectively as in the simpler world of a hundred years ago. Ours was the task to do more than to argue a theory. The times required the confident answer of performance to those whose instinctive faith in humanity made them want to believe that in the long run democracy would prove superior to more extreme forms of government as a process of getting action when action was wisdom without the spiritual sacrifices which those other forms of government exact.

That challenge we met. To meet it required unprecedented activities under Federal leadership—to end abuses—to restore a large measure of material prosperity—to give new faith to millions of our citizens who had been traditionally taught to expect that democracy would provide continuously wider opportunity and continuously greater security in a world where science was continuously making material riches more available to man.

In the many methods of attack with which we met these problems, you and I, by mutual understanding and by determination to cooperate, helped to make democracy succeed by refusing to permit unnecessary disagreement to arise between two of our branches of government. That spirit of cooperation was able to solve difficulties of extraordinary magnitude and ramification with few important errors, and at a cost cheap when measured by the immediate necessities and the eventual results.

I look forward to a continuance of that cooperation in the next 4 years. I look forward also to a continuance of the basis of that cooperation—mutual respect for each other's proper sphere of functioning in a democracy which is working well, and a common-sense realization of the need for play in the joints of the machine.

On that basis, it is within the right of the Congress to determine which of the many new activities shall be continued or abandoned, increased or curtailed.

On that same basis the President alone has the responsibility for their administration. I find that this task of Executive management has reached the point where our administrative machinery needs comprehensive overhauling. I shall, therefore, shortly address the Congress more fully in regard to modernizing and improving the executive branch of the Government.

That cooperation of the past 4 years between the Congress and the President has aimed at the fulfillment of a twofold policy—first, economic recovery through many kinds of assistance to agriculture, industry, and banking; and, second, deliberate improvement in the personal security and opportunity of the great mass of our people.

The recovery we sought was not to be merely temporary. It was to be a recovery protected from the causes of previous disasters. With that aim in view—to prevent a future similar crisis—you and I joined in a series of enactments—safe banking and sound currency, the guarantee of bank deposits, protection for the investor in securities, the removal of the threat of agricultural surpluses, insistence on collective bargaining, the outlawing of sweatshops, child labor and unfair trade practices, and the beginning of security for the aged and the worker.

Nor was the recovery we sought merely a purposeless whirring of machinery. It is important, of course, that every man and woman in the country be able to find work, that every factory run, that business as a whole earn profits. But government in a democratic nation does not exist solely, or ever primarily, for that purpose.

It is not enough that the wheels turn. They must carry us in the direction of a greater satisfaction in life for the average man. The deeper purpose of democratic government is to assist as many of its citizens as possible—especially those who need it most—to improve their conditions of life, to retain all personal liberty which does not adversely affect their neighbors, and to pursue the happiness which comes with security and an opportunity for recreation and culture.

Even with our present recovery we are far from the goal of that deeper purpose. There are far-reaching problems still with us for which democracy must find solutions if it is to consider itself successful.

For example, many millions of Americans still live in habitations which not only fail to provide the physical benefits of modern civilization but breed disease and impair the health of future generations. The menace exists not only in the slum areas of the very large cities, but in many smaller cities as well. It exists on tens of thousands of farms, in varying degrees, in every part of the country.

Another example is the prevalence of an un-American type of tenant farming. I do not suggest that every farm family has the capacity to earn a satisfactory living on its own farm. But many thousands of tenant farmers—indeed most of them—with some financial assistance and with some advice and training, can be made self-supporting on land which can eventually belong to them. The Nation would be wise to offer them that chance instead of permitting them to go along as they do now, year after year, with

neither future security as tenants nor hope of ownership of their homes nor expectation of bettering the lot of their children.

Another national problem is the intelligent development of our social security system, the broadening of the services it renders, and practical improvement in its operation. In many nations where such laws are in effect success in meeting the expectations of the community has come through frequent amendment of the original statute.

And, of course, the most far-reaching and the most inclusive problem of all is that of unemployment and the lack of economic balance, of which unemployment is at once the result and the symptom. The immediate question of adequate relief for the needy unemployed who are capable of performing useful work I shall discuss with the Congress during the coming months. The broader task of preventing unemployment is a matter of long-range evolutionary policy. To that we must continue to give our best thought and effort. We cannot assume that immediate industrial and commercial activity which mitigates present pressures justifies the National Government at this time in placing the unemployment problem in a filing cabinet of finished business.

Fluctuations in employment are tied to all other wasteful fluctuations in our mechanism of production and distribution. One of these wastes is speculation. In securities or commodities, the larger the volume of speculation the wider become the upward and downward swings and the more certain the result that in the long run there will be more losses than gains in the underlying wealth of the community.

And, as is now well known to all of us, the same net loss to society comes from reckless overproduction and monopolistic underproduction of natural and manufactured commodities.

Overproduction, underproduction, and speculation are three evil sisters who distill the troubles of unsound inflation and disastrous deflation. It is to the interest of the Nation to have government help private enterprise to gain sound general price levels and to protect those levels from wide perilous fluctuations. We know now that if early in 1931 government had taken the steps which were taken 2 and 3 years later the depression would never have reached the depths of the beginning of 1933.

Sober second thought confirms most of us in the belief that the broad objectives of the National Recovery Act were sound. We know now that its difficulties arose from the fact that it tried to do too much. For example, it was unwise to expect the same agency to regulate the length of working hours, minimum wages, child labor, and collective bargaining on the one hand and the complicated questions of unfair trade practices and business controls on the other.

The statute of N. R. A. has been outlawed. The problems have not. They are still with us.

That decent conditions and adequate pay for labor and just return for agriculture can be secured through parallel and simultaneous action by 48 States is a proven impossibility. It is equally impossible to obtain curbs on monopoly, unfair trade practices, and speculation by State action alone. There are those who, sincerely or insincerely, still cling to State action as a theoretical hope. But experience with actualities makes it clear that Federal laws supplementing State laws are needed to help solve the problems which result from modern invention applied in an industrialized nation which conducts its business with scant regard to State lines.

During the past year there has been a growing belief that there is little fault to be found with the Constitution of the United States as it stands today. The vital need is not an alteration of our fundamental law but an increasingly enlightened view with reference to it. Difficulties have grown out of its interpretation; but rightly considered, it can be used as an instrument of progress and not as a device for prevention of action.

It is worth our while to read and re-read the preamble of the Constitution and article I thereof which confers the legislative powers upon the Congress of the United States. It is also worth our while to read again the debates in the Constitutional Convention of 150 years ago. From such reading, I obtain the very definite thought that the mem-

bers of that Convention were fully aware that civilization would raise problems for the proposed new Federal Government, which they themselves could not even surmise; and that it was their definite intent and expectation that a liberal interpretation in the years to come would give to the Congress the same relative powers over new national problems as they themselves gave to the Congress over the national problems of their day.

In presenting to the Convention the first basic draft of the Constitution, Edmund Randolph explained that it was the purpose "to insert essential principles only, lest the operation of government should be clogged by rendering those provisions permanent and unalterable which ought to be accommodated to times and events."

With a better understanding of our purposes, and a more intelligent recognition of our needs as a nation, it is not to be assumed that there will be prolonged failure to bring legislative and judicial action into closer harmony. Means must be found to adapt our legal forms and our judicial interpretation to the actual present national needs of the largest progressive democracy in the modern world.

That thought leads to a consideration of world problems. To go no further back than the beginning of this century, men and women everywhere were seeking conditions of life very different from those which were customary before modern invention and modern industry and modern communications had come into being. The World War, for all of its tragedy, encouraged these demands and stimulated action to fulfill these new desires.

Many national governments seemed unable adequately to respond; and, often with the improvident assent of the masses of the people themselves, new forms of government were set up with oligarchy taking the place of democracy. In oligarchies, militarism has leaped forward, while in those nations which have retained democracy militarism has waned.

I have recently visited three of our sister republics in South America. The very cordial receptions with which I was greeted were in tribute to democracy. To me the outstanding observation of that visit was that the masses of the peoples of all the Americas are convinced that the democratic form of government can be made to succeed and do not wish to substitute for it any other form of government. They believe that democracies are best able to cope with the changing problems of modern civilization within themselves, and that democracies are best able to maintain peace among themselves.

The Inter-American Conference, operating on these fundamental principles of democracy, did much to assure peace in this hemisphere. Existing peace machinery was improved. New instruments to maintain peace and eliminate causes of war were adopted. Wider protection of the interests of the American republics in the event of war outside the Western Hemisphere was provided. Respect for, and observance of, international treaties and international law were strengthened. Principles of liberal trade policies, as effective aids to the maintenance of peace were reaffirmed. The intellectual and cultural relationships among American republics were broadened as a part of the general peace program.

In a world unhappily thinking in terms of war, the representatives of 21 nations sat around a table, in an atmosphere of complete confidence and understanding, sincerely discussing measures for maintaining peace. Here was a great and a permanent achievement directly affecting the lives and security of the 250,000,000 human beings who dwell in this Western Hemisphere. Here was an example which must have a wholesome effect upon the rest of the world.

In a very real sense, the conference in Buenos Aires sent forth a message on behalf of all the democracies of the world to those nations which live otherwise. Because such other governments are perhaps more spectacular, it was high time for democracy to assert itself.

Because all of us believe that our democratic form of government can cope adequately with modern problems as they arise, it is patriotic as well as logical for us to prove

that we can meet new national needs with new laws consistent with a historic constitutional framework clearly intended to receive liberal and not narrow interpretation.

The United States of America, within itself, must continue the task of making democracy succeed.

In that task the legislative branch of our Government will, I am confident, continue to meet the demands of democracy whether they relate to the curbing of abuses, the extension of help to those who need help, or the better balancing of our interdependent economies.

So, too, the executive branch of the Government must move forward in this task, and, at the same time, provide better management for administrative action of all kinds.

The judicial branch also is asked by the people to do its part in making democracy successful. We do not ask the courts to call nonexistent powers into being, but we have a right to expect that conceded powers or those legitimately implied shall be made effective instruments for the common good.

The process of our democracy must not be imperiled by the denial of essential powers of free government.

Your task and mine is not ending with the end of the depression. The people of the United States have made it clear that they expect us to continue our active efforts in behalf of their peaceful advancement.

In that spirit of endeavor and service I greet the Seventy-Fifth Congress at the beginning of this auspicious new year.

At 2 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m., the President retired from the Hall of the House.

At 2 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m., the Speaker announced that the joint session was dissolved.

Thereupon the Vice President and the Members of the Senate returned to their Chamber.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. DRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 43

Whereas BEN CRAVENS, a Representative from the State of Arkansas, from the fourth district thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Speaker, or a deputy named by him, be, and he is hereby, authorized to administer the oath of office to said BEN CRAVENS in the District of Columbia, and that the said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said BEN CRAVENS.

The resolution was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF THE NEUTRALITY ACT

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, an unusual condition now exists, which, to my mind, makes it necessary for this House to take some immediate action. I refer to shipments of armament being made to the scene of the civil war now being carried on in Spain.

I am sure that no man in this House wants to be a party to this carnage. It is necessary for immediate action to be taken to stop these shipments. The President is very anxious that this should be done, but under the law as it exists at the present time the law does not apply to civil warfare. You have noticed from the press that licenses have been issued to parties who are in a great rush to get this armament

out of the United States before such shipment can be stopped. There is a race on between the Congress and the people who want to send these deadly instruments of warfare to Spain to help carry on this carnage.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to offer a resolution which would empower this House to take this matter up this afternoon. I want it understood that the Senate has a similar resolution, and it will probably be passed before we can take action here. If you permit this matter to be considered now we can offer the resolution as a substitute for the Senate measure.

Mr. Speaker, I offer the resolution, which I now send to the desk and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it may be in order for the Speaker to recognize the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 80, entitled "A joint resolution to prohibit the exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war from the United States to Spain."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MAVERICK, Mr. FISH, and Mr. O'MALLEY rose.

Mr. BERNARD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, will not the gentleman withhold his objection so we may explain the purpose of the resolution?

Mr. BERNARD. I withhold it, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK].

SPANISH CIVIL WAR IMPORTANT TO THE WHOLE WORLD

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, this matter is probably the most important that will come before us this year and I want to make a few observations before we take up this resolution. This is a reversal of a policy of the United States Government of 150 years. It is a reversal of international law of four centuries.

We may have a revolution in Mexico very soon. If so, it will be financed by American money and we will be placed in the position of having a revolution in a sister republic financed with American money, and our hands will be tied by a precedent like this. With American money the Mexican insurgents, if rebellion occurs, will get their munitions in Europe. We are setting a bad precedent.

RESOLUTION ON NEUTRALITY LAST YEAR NO GOOD; NEITHER IS THIS

Mr. Speaker, I do not say this resolution is wrong, but it refers to Spain alone. Last year I stated that the resolution on neutrality we enacted then was no good, and times have shown this to be true. I now say that this one is not either. If we are going to have neutrality, let us have it for the whole world [applause]; and if we do not have it for the whole world, let us not have it at all.

We wanted neutrality the last time and we did not get it. This is not neutrality, it is against neutrality. We are taking a stand against a democratic government, the parliamentary Government of Spain; and we are not indulging in neutrality, because this is the opposite. I am in favor of neither side in any foreign country. But we must face the facts. I think we should have some time to discuss the matter and not just 20 minutes. We talk for hours, days, and weeks on matters which are unimportant, and we rush through matters of such grave importance as this.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman from Texas concluded for the present?

Mr. MAVERICK. I reserve the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I have considerable sympathy with the remarks of the gentleman from Texas. As the gentleman stated, it seems to me this is one of the most important pieces of legislation that will come before this body.

We should give it every possible consideration. I am quite sure that on our side there is no desire to block or delay

any consideration of this joint resolution, but we should like ample time to discuss it and an opportunity, if necessary, to amend it and to strike out the preamble. We are prepared on this side to consider the resolution immediately and adopt it, if necessary, before adjournment today. But we insist that it should not come up under a gag rule with only 20 minutes on each side and with no right to amend.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Let me say that there is no inclination by anyone to cut off debate. I shall be glad, if this resolution is passed by unanimous consent, to have an hour for debate.

Mr. MAVERICK. Will it be subject to amendment?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. That is not in the resolution.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it seems to me that the gentleman from Tennessee is not indulging in overgenerosity by suggesting an hour for debate. In my judgment, this is one of the most important matters that will come before Congress at this session. I believe that we should have several hours' debate, with the opportunity for amendment, so that we can consider it fairly and squarely. I am sure that Members will be glad to stay here until midnight, if necessary, in order to dispose of the matter. We do demand that we should have adequate time to consider it.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, we should have an hour on each side. The Speaker yesterday stated that this is the greatest deliberative body in the world and here we are starting off under a gag rule without the power of amendment. I am sure that no time will be lost if we are given an hour on each side with the right to amend.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, from the information that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS] gives us, it is apparent that this resolution, which I have not seen—and I doubt whether other Members have seen it in print—applies only to Spain. If it is intended to bring about neutrality and stop the shipment of arms to countries engaged in civil war, why does it not say all countries engaged in civil war?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'MALLEY. Why pick out Spain? I remind this House that 4 years ago when I first took my seat, a bill was brought in here, was hastened, it was said the President wanted it, and only 11 Members voted against it. I was one of those 11. A few days later we found that it had been tabled in the other body because the President had wanted nothing like it. Why hurry about this thing, why rush it through in this way under suspension of the rules, when nobody can amend it? Why do we not have some debate, why can we not spend all day on this question, and if necessary, until midnight? There are some of us who believe we have a duty here to spend some time in considering the grave questions that confront us, instead of trying to rush legislation so as to be free to pursue our private efforts.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. The present neutrality law will expire by its terms before this session of Congress will have adjourned. It is natural to assume that during this session we shall have general neutrality legislation upon which there will be adequate opportunity for debate and for amendment. My understanding is that the purpose of this resolution is not the enactment of general neutrality legislation but merely to correct a defect which has arisen through world circumstances that make an amendment to the present temporary neutrality law necessary, which still leaves it necessary for us later to enact general neutrality legislation. Is not that correct?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The gentleman is correct. The present neutrality law expires May 1, but the present law does not cover this civil war.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. In a moment. We are now working on a general neutrality law which will come before this House and which will cover any condition of civil warfare

in any country when it is brought to the House; and as far as I am concerned gentlemen may have all the time in the world to debate it. At this time, this is an emergency. These shipments are being made, and what we are trying to do now is to stop the shipment by this special act. That is the reason I am asking for this special consideration. I was advised by a Senator a few minutes ago that that body would pass this resolution this afternoon.

Mr. O'MALLEY. This body, under the rules, cannot consider what another body may do in respect to a piece of legislation.

Mr. BOILEAU and Mr. MAVERICK rose.

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK].

IF YOU DO NOT SELL TO SPAIN, DO NOT SELL TO ANY COUNTRY

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I think this legislation is hasty and ill-advised. It was hasty and ill-advised last year, and there is no occasion for this sudden action. Why have we not been more fully advised? It just covers Spain. Why should we not apply it equally to all countries? The revolution in Spain has been going on for 7 months. It has always been the practice of our Government to send munitions to the legal government, irrespective of its merits. If we are to send munitions at all, send them to every nation—to Hitler or Mussolini, if they have a revolution. It has always been the policy of this Nation to maintain the status quo of the recognized parliamentary government or of the de facto, or even the Fascist government. Why, then, should we pick out Spain and suddenly say that we will pass this bit of emergency legislation? One of the criticisms of our Government has been that it indulges in hasty and ill-advised legislation. They have been killing each other over there in Spain for several months. What we do in the next few minutes will not amount to much; possibly they will kill each other for 10 hours more. We treated the American troops in that way around the time of the armistice. I want the gentleman to say why we should violate the precedents of 150 years, pick out Spain, and not pass a general law. I favor an embargo against every nation.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. But the gentleman from Texas is mistaken about the precedents.

Mr. MAVERICK. No, no. I have been studying this problem for a long time.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but I cite him to the special acts which we passed for the control of a situation in South America, and I cite him further to the acts we passed for the control of a situation in China, where we have extraterritorial jurisdiction.

Mr. MAVERICK. I am willing that our continents of America should protect themselves, but I am not willing to take part in a European squabble. If we exclude Spain, let us exclude also Germany, Soviet Russia, Japan—all nations on earth, except possibly nations on our own continent, which is another question.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, under the rule this resolution cannot be amended by a single word or line. Is not that correct, I ask the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. If this resolution is passed, it cannot.

Mr. O'MALLEY. It cannot. In the manner in which your committee has brought it up, it cannot be amended. The bill reads "Spain", so it will be impossible for any Member to insert in place of the word "Spain" the words "all countries engaged in civil war." Is that not correct?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. That is correct, but let me say to the gentleman this only applies where there is civil warfare, where our people are attempting to ship armaments. I know that the Members of this House do not want these arms shipped to Spain or to any other country where civil warfare is going on.

Mr. MAVERICK. I did not want them shipped to Italy last year.

Mr. PIERCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. PIERCE. Is it true that these munitions are going to friends of democracy in Spain?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. They are going to both sides, I understand.

Mr. PIERCE. Is it undue haste to support the friends of democracy in Spain?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY].

Mr. CONNERY. I am in entire sympathy with what the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS] is attempting to do, but there are two points which I want cleared up. It is the desire of the gentleman to stop these shipments that are now in New York Harbor going across to people either for or against the Government of Spain?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Yes, sir.

Mr. CONNERY. We want to stop that. Now, suppose some of those shipments are consigned to Germany and they are to go into Spain. What about that?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. This resolution covers that. It does not mention Germany, but it says "any neutral country."

Mr. CONNERY. And the gentleman intends to bring in legislation later which we will have a chance to debate and amend?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Yes; absolutely.

Mr. CONNERY. Ordinarily I would not vote for this kind of rule, but I am in hearty sympathy with what the gentleman is trying to do, and I shall vote for the resolution.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I should like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee whether this legislation has been submitted to the Department of State and whether it has had the approval of the Secretary of State?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. It has the approval of the Secretary of State, and it has been approved by the President of the United States personally.

Mr. HILL of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. HILL of Washington. I am in hearty sympathy with this kind of legislation, but why not make it general? May I ask the gentleman from Tennessee, if there were a revolution in England today, would he introduce this resolution?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I surely would, if it were a civil war.

Mr. HILL of Washington. Against the present government in England?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. If I had my way about it, it would cover every country, and I expect to offer an amendment to the bill when it comes before this House later, covering any civil war.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that the administration could have refused to issue a license for the shipment of these airplanes to Spain?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The administration could not refuse; otherwise it would have refused.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understood they could have refused to issue a license.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. They had no legal right to refuse it.

Mr. BOILEAU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BOILEAU. I should like to ask if it is not a fact that the reason for asking immediate consideration is upon the theory that unless this resolution is passed today, this boat which we have read so much about will be sailing on toward Spain?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. That and other boats, yes.

Mr. BOILEAU. I understand the boat was on its way about 20 minutes ago, and that even if we act today the Senate undoubtedly will not act until tomorrow—

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I understood they would act today.

Mr. BOILEAU. In any event, does not the gentleman believe we ought to have a couple of hours this afternoon to talk about it and thresh this thing out, and then take it up for amendment tomorrow morning?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. We want to catch them before they get outside the 3-mile limit.

Mr. BOILEAU. They ought to make that before we ever pass this bill.

Mr. MAVERICK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

LET US ENACT NEUTRALITY NOW

Mr. MAVERICK. The gentleman said when this comes up on the floor later he is willing for an amendment to be added which will make it apply to all countries. I am willing for it to apply to all countries now. Is the gentleman not willing to let this be considered for amendment, so that we can apply it to the British Empire and the German Fascist Government, and every other country? I say this because I hope we stop arms shipments to every country.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. May I say to the gentleman there is no country where this could apply soon? This is an emergency, and for that reason we are asking that it apply only to Spain.

Within the next 2 or 3 weeks a general neutrality bill will be presented to the House in which there will be provision applying to civil war in any country and giving the President power to stop the shipment of armaments to those countries.

Mr. MAVERICK. Is the present situation in Spain one of civil war, or is it intervention by Italy and Germany?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I do not know what is causing it, but I know they are fighting over there, and we do not want to get into it. [Applause.]

Mr. MAVERICK. All right; let us not get into it; let us keep out of it. But let us keep out of all wars and not just the Spanish.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I am doing all in my power, and my committee is doing all in its power, to keep this country out of war. [Applause.]

Mr. MAVERICK. So am I. And so is everybody else on this floor.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. EATON. Are we to understand this resolution will cancel these licenses which have been issued by the State Department?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. It will if the ships are not over 3 miles at sea by the time it becomes law.

Mr. EATON. Suppose the shipments are consigned to Germany or to Italy.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. This covers shipments to any neutral country which shipments we have reason to know are going to a warring country.

Mr. EATON. Does the resolution so state?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. HEALEY. In answer to the question propounded by the gentleman from Massachusetts the gentleman from Tennessee stated that under existing laws the licenses could not be withheld.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. HEALEY. Is it the purpose of this resolution to prevent further licenses being issued for the purpose of shipping munitions of war?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Yes; to Spain.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Can the gentleman advise how it is possible for us to give adequate study to this resolution when it is not even in print? Some of us do not like to vote for bills when we have not copies of them to study.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I can give the gentleman a copy of this resolution. It is brought up in its present shape because of the emergency; but there is not very much to consider, I

may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin; it is just a plain little resolution.

Mr. O'MALLEY. If it is only a question of the stopping of the one or two shipments that have already been licensed, I am wondering, if the Government really wanted to stop them, whether they could not find some reason why those ships should not leave port.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I know of no way in which it could be done.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. I may say to the chairman of this committee that I think there is not a man or woman in the House who does not want and who does not expect the gentleman's committee to bring in general neutrality legislation; but the very mechanics of bringing in general legislation is such that it makes it impossible to do it today. This is strictly and solely an emergency proposition. This resolution is brought in to meet a specific emergency and nothing else.

I ask the gentleman if it is not his purpose when he brings in general neutrality legislation to bring it in under such conditions that each and every Member of the House may be heard and may have full opportunity to offer amendments?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The gentleman is exactly right about it. We are trying now to formulate the new neutrality bill, which will be introduced, I hope, in a few days. When this neutrality bill comes to the floor of the House, if I have my way, it will be under an open rule and every Member can be heard and can offer amendments. We want that bill to be thoroughly discussed.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Does the gentleman object to the offering of any amendment to the pending resolution?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I am afraid it would delay its passage.

Mr. MAVERICK. Why should it delay passage if debate is limited to 2 hours?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I am willing to give the gentleman plenty of time; that is all I can do. I shall take scarcely any time. I will give the gentleman most of my time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MAVERICK and Mr. BERNARD objected.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole, and that debate be limited to half an hour a side, subject to the rules of the House.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will not the gentleman make it an hour a side?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The resolution will be considered under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will withdraw his objection.

Mr. O'MALLEY. If in addition to the hour's debate, divided equally, the resolution will be taken up under the 5-minute rule, I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAVERICK. Do I understand that if the resolution comes up in the way now requested by the gentleman from Tennessee that amendments may be offered?

The SPEAKER. Yes; under the general rules of the House.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will not the gentleman be willing to make the time 45 minutes to a side?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask the consideration of the membership and hope they will not insist on more than half an hour a side, for the resolution is to be consid-

ered under the 5-minute rule. I hope no objection will be made.

Mr. FISH. Is it the intention of the committee to consider it under the 5-minute rule?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. FISH. I do not think there will be objection to that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that this resolution may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole, that general debate be limited to 1 hour, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS] and one-half by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], at the expiration of which time the bill is to be read under the 5-minute rule.

Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BERNARD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. BOILEAU. I may state that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BERNARD] was on his feet and tried two or three times to gain the attention of the Speaker and to object. I am sure the Speaker did not see the gentleman from Minnesota, but he was on his feet attempting to make his objection. I therefore request the Speaker to give further consideration to the gentleman's wishes in this respect.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I think the gentleman's objection came too late.

Mr. BERNARD. Mr. Speaker, I objected four times.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I understood the Chair had already ruled.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BERNARD] state to the Chair that he was on his feet objecting to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BERNARD. Mr. Speaker, I objected four times.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman on his feet when the Chair put the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BERNARD. I objected; yes.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make an announcement at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee will meet in 10 minutes.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now recess until 3:30 o'clock today.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House (at 3 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) resumed its session.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution to prohibit the exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war from the United States to Spain.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. GIBSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments", for the disposition of executive papers in the following

departments, viz: Department of the Treasury, Department of War, Department of the Interior, Department of Agriculture, Department of Commerce, Department of Labor, United States Tariff Commission, and Export-Import Bank of Washington.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order at this time to consider the Senate joint resolution which has just been reported to the House under the general rules of the House, with 1 hour's general debate, to be equally divided between the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

The SPEAKER. Does the Chair understand the request provides that the resolution shall be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, that, of course, will give opportunity for the offering of amendments?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Yes.

Mr. BOILEAU. And there is provided an hour's debate altogether?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. BERNARD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I file a privileged resolution for printing in the RECORD and move the present consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

House Resolution 44

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union shall consider the joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 3; that there shall be not to exceed 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, whereupon the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the House consider the resolution?

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the House decided to consider the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report Senate Joint Resolution No. 3.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 3

Resolved, etc., That during the existence of the state of civil strife now obtaining in Spain it shall, from and after the approval of this resolution, be unlawful to export arms, ammunition, or implements of war from any place in the United States, or possessions of the United States, to Spain or to any other foreign country for transshipment to Spain or for use of either of the opposing forces in Spain.

Arms, ammunition, or implements of war, the exportation of which is prohibited by this resolution, are those enumerated in the President's proclamation, no. 2163, of April 10, 1936.

Licenses heretofore issued under existing law for the exportation of arms, ammunition, or implements of war to Spain, shall, as to all future exportations thereunder, ipso facto, be deemed to be canceled.

Whoever in violation of any of the provisions of this resolution shall export, or attempt to export, or cause to be exported, either directly or indirectly, arms, ammunition, or implements of war from the United States or any of its possessions, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both. When in the judgment of the President the conditions described in this resolution shall have ceased to exist he shall proclaim such fact, and the provisions thereof shall thereupon cease to apply.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, may I submit a parliamentary inquiry for information?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MAVERICK. Is the Senate bill the same as the House measure except that all the whereases are cut out?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not able to acquaint the gentleman of that fact.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I may say that the wording is exactly the same, with that exception.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Texas that the Chair is informed by the Clerk that the Senate resolution does not contain a preamble.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. That is the only change.

Mr. WOODRUM assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there should be no difference of opinion about the necessity for the immediate adoption of this resolution. It is a resolution not designed to enact general neutrality legislation, that being a matter which will shortly be considered in this House, because the present neutrality law under its own terms will expire on May 1, and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House will soon begin hearings upon a new bill, which will be promptly reported to the House, and this body will then have opportunity to consider fully and fairly a permanent measure with respect to neutrality.

The pending resolution, which this afternoon was passed by the Senate, as I understand, by a vote of 80 to nothing, is now before us for adoption or rejection. The only difference between the Senate resolution, as passed by that body, which we are now considering, and the House joint resolution, which the chairman of our committee, Mr. McREYNOLDS, sought to have considered, but which consideration was prevented by objection of certain gentlemen, is that the preamble is stricken from the measure. The preamble merely set forth the reasons which not only justify, but, in my judgment, demand, its passage.

The immediate passage of this measure is necessary because of the grave condition which exists with respect to the revolution now going on in Spain. The measure is not discriminatory in favor of or against either of the belligerents. We take no sides in that controversy by passing this resolution. Its terms apply equally and alike to both belligerents, and prohibits the shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to the defenders of the existing Spanish Government or to the insurgents who are seeking to overthrow it, and it also prohibits the shipment to any other country for reshipment to Spain.

Our existing neutrality law prohibits such shipments when two or more countries are in a state of war, but it does not apply to a civil war wholly within a country.

The bloody war now being so relentlessly waged in Spain is not local; it is more than a civil war; it involves not only the peace of Spain but threatens the peace of the world.

Certain European powers who love war more than peace are giving aid and comfort to the respective belligerents and are aligning themselves with one side or the other, and a general European war is not only a possibility but constitutes a grave menace at this hour.

If we permit our munition makers or those who deal in implements of war to supply them to either of these belligerents, we not only countenance but we encourage and aid in the continuance of that war—a war which, if continued, may not only involve Europe but may embroil the nations of the earth in another great world war.

The necessity for the immediate passage of this resolution is due to the fact that the munition dealers are trying to ship their implements of death and destruction before Congress can act to prevent them from doing so; as proof of this let me read a news item which appeared in today's Baltimore Sun:

A race, dramatic but perilous to the peace of the world, is on between the Congress of the United States and at least two exporters of arms now loading or assembling implements of war for Spain.

If the House and Senate leaders, backed by the White House, can drive through a concurrent resolution by tomorrow night empowering the State Department to cancel existing export licenses, one

shipment of aircraft, now being loaded in New York with feverish speed, may be held up.

Another shipment of even greater value, licensed late today and consigned to the Spanish Ambassador to Mexico but ordered sent to Valencia, would surely be embargoed.

SECOND EXPORTER GETS LICENSE

This second shipment license was obtained by Richard L. Dineley, a Pacific coast exporter, and he plans to send \$4,507,000 worth of airplanes, machine guns, and millions of cartridges to the Spanish Socialist Government. He said his contract calls for delivery of goods worth in all about \$9,000,000, for in addition to the war materials for which he obtained a license, he said it calls for gas masks and other items not covered by the licensing law.

This exporter asserted he was acting through the "Consolidated Industries Co." which he described as a "dummy" for several munitions companies.

I may state further that if we want to stop the shipment of arms and munitions that are now being sent to Spain, the thing for us to do is to pass this resolution before we adjourn, without a single amendment, for the adoption of one amendment would necessitate delay in securing the Senate's concurrence, and delay would be to the advantage only of the munition dealers. They are the only persons who should oppose this resolution.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Texas 2 additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if we pass this resolution, we give notice to the world that insofar as we are concerned we are for peace and that the United States will not give countenance, aid, or comfort to the cruel and barbarous war now being waged in Spain by furnishing them with the implements of death and destruction. The policy of our President is well known. He stands for peace. America is a great peace-loving nation and we should align ourselves with those countries that believe in peace and not in war.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not take any further time of the House. This is not the time to discuss what kind of neutrality legislation should be finally enacted. It should have teeth in it and be designed to keep our country out of the wars of other countries. This is a specific resolution dealing with a specific situation in Spain, about which there should be no difference of opinion. There is not a condition existing in the world at this time comparable with the condition existing in Spain, and we cannot pass any legislation that will affect any other country as it would Spain, because the conditions there are entirely different from those prevailing in any other part of the world.

I submit the question to the House and ask for a vote in favor of the resolution without amendment, and there should not be a single vote against it. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I have secured a typed copy of the pending resolution, and I should like to call to the attention of the Committee the next to the last paragraph, which provides that whoever violates any of the provisions of this law or shall attempt to do so, or shall attempt to export, directly or indirectly, and so forth, and I am wondering how it will be possible under the wording of the resolution to prevent a person making a shipment of munitions to a foreign country and then transshipping such shipment to a country where there is civil war.

I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK], who spoke earlier in the day, expressed the sentiment of the majority of the House. Why would it not be better to bring in a resolution that applies to the shipment of munitions of all kinds whenever there is a civil war anywhere in the world? Then you could not transship at all. There is nothing to prevent the shipment of munitions that my good friend Mr. JOHNSON has mentioned to some country where there is no civil war and then transship to Spain. They can first ship to Mexico, or San Salvador, or Guatemala, and then transship to Spain.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I think the gentleman has overlooked the first section of the bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. I have not overlooked any part of the bill. But after these shipments leave this country we lose all control over them. If we want to be really neutral we should pass legislation that will make it absolutely impossible for an American to ship munitions to any country where there is war, civil or otherwise.

All you are doing here I am afraid—and I hope I am wrong—is to simply delay the shipment by compelling the owner to ship to a neutral country and then transship to the country where civil war exists.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In answer to the gentleman's question as to why this legislation should not be general, we thought that under the conditions existing in Spain there would be no difference of opinion, whereas there might be if we applied it to all countries. We thought that we could pass this legislation and then later extend it to all countries.

Mr. KNUTSON. How long will it be before we can look for legislation of that character?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. We expect to get at it as soon as we can have hearings.

Mr. SCOTT. With reference to the shipment of munitions from this country to Spain, under present conditions are not Italy and Germany supplying most of the munitions that are used by the insurgents in Spain, and perhaps men? Would this then prohibit our shipping any munitions at the present time to either Italy or Germany?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The resolution provides that during the existence of the state of civil strife in Spain, and so forth, it shall be unlawful to export arms and ammunition from any place in the United States to Spain or to any other country for transshipment to Spain.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK].

LAW SUGGESTED IS INEFFECTIVE

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious and a very important matter. It is perhaps the most important that will come before us this year, because it involves war. At the very outset I state one reason why we should pass a general law: Even though you say that munitions cannot be transshipped to Spain, yet they can be. In the present form of the bill it is ineffective. But if you prohibit arms shipment to the whole world, then we know that Spain will not get any of the munitions. The thing we ought to do is to pass a general law, and we can do that today. I am going to offer an amendment to that effect.

The law that we are passing now is not neutrality in the proper sense. Last year when we were talking about Italy and Abyssinia, it was said that we could not pass the law because Italy was already at war; but what about Spain? Spain has been fighting for 7 months, and there has been no declaration of belligerency by this country. Suddenly Congress gets in a dither and passes this law prohibiting the shipment of arms to Spain. I see no reason why we should do that at this time, unless we adopt a general policy and make it apply to all nations. If we pass this bill, we are establishing a precedent and a very bad one.

WHAT WILL WE DO ABOUT MEXICO AND THE BRITISH CROWN?

I know something about Mexico. It is my opinion that certain people in the United States of America are attempting to cause a revolution in the Republic of Mexico. Mexico is our sister Republic. What are we going to do about it? We are going to establish a precedent that we will not ship arms to any country, and so we will not send any munitions to the authorized Government of Mexico, and the revolution will then be financed by people in this country who have the money to make a revolution. Therefore the United States would be committing an unneutral act in connection with Mexico or in any nations in South America should revolutions occur there.

Let us be frank. Suppose there was a revolution in England. Suppose that England wanted some munitions to stop a rebellion against the British Crown. Nearly every man on this floor would say, "My God, are you taking sides against

the ancient Crown of England?" Of course not. We would sell England all the munitions she wanted—and that is the reason this resolution only applies to Spain. They are selling munitions now to England, to Germany, and many different countries. So we sell munitions to Germany, but refuse to sell munitions to Spain. Is this not a fine diplomatic pickle? What we ought to do is to prohibit the shipment of arms to all the countries of the world. I hope this country will give up any idea of making a single dime out of war. I want to control these munitions racketeers, so there are no profits in war, and so we export to no nation.

THIS RESOLUTION IS OBJECTIONABLE FROM THREE POINTS

There are several things about this bill that are objectionable:

First, it is unneutral, ill-advised legislation. It is sought to be accomplished in too much of a hurry.

Second, it is not fair, not comprehensive enough, does not make a general policy, but only a bad precedent.

Third, it does not effectually meet the situation of the munitions business at all.

Let us consider Spain. The Government of Spain is the duly authorized, elected parliamentary government.

I have read in the papers that it is a Communist government, and even if it is a Fascist government, yet it is the Government of Spain as a nation, and according to international law it is none of our business what form of government is adopted on any country—including Italy and Germany. We are now reversing a policy of 150 years by not being neutral, by refraining from sending munitions to the duly authorized Government of Spain.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODRUM). The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more.

SPAIN AND ALL NATIONS SHOULD RECEIVE EQUAL TREATMENT

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, we are committing an act which is unneutral against the duly elected parliamentary Government of Spain, a parliamentary government like this Government, though we may not agree with it. There are two alternatives, at least there are in my mind. I am opposed to the shipment of munitions to any foreign country at all. I do not want to ship them to Spain and I do not want to ship them to Germany, but if Germany should have a revolution, she is entitled to the munitions as much as Spain. England is entitled to have them shipped. We are not being fair in this way in our international relations. To settle the question send no munitions out to any nation.

I am going to offer an amendment to make this apply to the whole world and I hope we will not waste any time in agreeing to it. Gentlemen say that they are going to bring in general neutrality laws in a short time. Do it now. Why wait? Let us have neutrality now and be fair to the whole world. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF].

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have fought consistently for neutrality in the last 2 years can at least feel that we are making some progress, although it has been slow, uphill work. I recall only too well last year when the Neutrality Act of 1935 was about to expire on the 29th day of February. Many of us could not get the bill then pending out of the present committee in order that we might have adequate time to debate it and offer amendments. When it finally did come out, after a group of us called upon the President and insisted that it be brought out, it was brought out under suspension of the rules, which prohibited amendment.

Had we been permitted to discuss this all-important subject fully and freely, instead of 40 minutes, as was the case, and had we been permitted to offer amendments at that time, we could have prevented, not only this situation but others that no doubt will arise because of inadequacy of discussion. Open discussion never injured any worthy cause, and neutrality is a most worthy cause.

This resolution refers only to civil war in Spain. Why not in other countries? Surely we are not going to make exceptions and thereby play favorites. Civil war may break out today, tomorrow—who knows when?—in some other country on this earth. Conditions are ripe in certain countries for just such a contingency. Why should we wait until it happens before we lay down a course of conduct? Is it because there are secret agreements or unofficial assurances to favored nations as to what our conduct shall be? I, for one, wish to adhere to a sound policy of minding our own business. Therefore, I shall support the amendment of the gentleman from Texas or the gentleman from Massachusetts in order that all countries may be included in the scope of this measure. Personally, I favor a declaration which will declare it to be our national policy to prohibit shipments of munitions to any place any time when war, civil or otherwise, takes place.

I do not want to hurt anyone's sensitive feelings in this matter, but it is the fault of the committee that we are in our present predicament and that the Government of this country finds itself unable to act, because of the blunder that was made by the committee bringing it in under suspension of the rules, prohibiting us from placing any amendments on it. Now that blunder is to be repeated by this type of hasty, ill-considered, ill-advised legislation. We are being told that this resolution is to be offered because an emergency exists. There have been broadcasts in the newspapers of this country for the last 2 weeks telling about the sales of these munitions. Why was not a rule brought in yesterday? We were here. We had nothing else to do. We adjourned early. Why did we not debate the rule for a couple of hours on yesterday? Why were we not advised as to what this resolution was to be, and an opportunity given to have it printed, so that we might read it and consider amendments? We are forced to debate this subject without any copies of this resolution.

It seems to me that every time the subject of neutrality comes up we are faced with this same proposition that we have to fight every inch of the way to get the smallest and the least consideration to have full and open discussion. If we are all in favor of neutrality—and we claim we are—then why do we not have some neutrality, instead of talking about discouraging debate and harassing those who want to discuss it freely, and only too often come in with the suggestion that we proceed to its consideration without amendment?

The chairman of the committee suggests we will not have any such civil condition arising in any of the other countries and that we should pass this at once as an emergency measure. Much as I esteem the judgment of the chairman of the committee, I claim that he has no divine authority nor omniscient powers to judge whether or not there is going to be a civil war in any other country as well as in Spain. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF] has expired.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I have just listened to the distinguished gentleman's lecture. I am very sorry we did not have the counsel of his wisdom and advice when we were trying to draw a neutrality bill at the last session. If he ever came before that committee or offered a suggestion, no one knows it, and no one knows yet that he had anything to do with bringing out the bill. What he seems to be mad about now is that last session, when I brought the bill here, it could not be amended, and now he is mad because I have brought one here that can be amended. [Laughter and applause.] That is his consistency.

I want to say to the distinguished gentleman that we reported out a bill, and I applied to the Rules Committee for a rule, but later it was found that it could not be passed in the Senate. Then we compromised on the bill that was passed.

Are you neutral? Do you want neutrality? I want to save this country from becoming involved in European wars, and I shall not be a party to the carnage and crucifixion that is

going on in Spain, and I want to see the eyes of the men in this House who will. That is the way I feel about it. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KLOEB].

Mr. KLOEB. Mr. Speaker, for 4 years I have sat in the deliberations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House in the study of neutrality legislation. Permit me to say as a lawyer that when you consider the question of setting aside long years of principles as established by international law, when you attempt to curtail the established principles of the freedom of the seas, you are attacking big problems.

Let us consider the history of neutrality for a moment. Back in 1898 the McKinley bill was passed which gave to the President of the United States absolute authority to embargo, in his discretion, not only munitions of war but materials used in the conduct of war. That law remained the law of this country until the year 1912. In 1933 both Houses passed the Johnson bill prohibiting loans to any nations in default on their indebtedness to the United States, thus marking the first recent attempt at the passage of so-called neutrality legislation, although its purpose was essentially punitive.

In 1935 we passed a short-term neutrality law. In 1936 the House committee reported out a very comprehensive bill and sought for weeks to obtain a rule to bring that bill before this House. Then, ascertaining that that bill could not possibly pass the Senate, and desiring neutrality legislation with teeth in it, both Houses passed the 1936 bill, which happened to be a bill that I introduced, and is now the law of the land. This law is absolutely mandatory. It prohibits the making of loans and the extension of credits. It prohibits the sale and export of munitions of war to any nation engaged in war. It expires by limitation on May 1.

Unfortunately, this subject was new to all of us. We were plowing new ground. We could not possibly foresee that within 12 months there would occur another great civil war in one of the major nations on the face of this earth. So we are now confronted with this emergency measure, which is not discretionary at all, but which is mandatory upon the President of the United States to invoke its provisions immediately it becomes law.

Permit me to say that another body has passed this resolution by a vote of 80 to nothing this very afternoon. Permit me to say further that the head of the celebrated Nye Munitions Investigating Committee, who abhors as much as I do the sale and traffic in munitions of war between nations, and who is an advocate of Government manufacture of munitions, undoubtedly was present in the Senate this afternoon when this resolution was passed by a vote of 80 to nothing.

This resolution is mandatory. It absolutely prohibits the sale of actual munitions of war to either side in the civil controversy now going on in Spain. We are asked why we do not extend the provisions of this resolution so as to prohibit the sale and shipment of munitions of war to any country where civil war is being waged. We expect to provide for that contingency in the permanent bill that will soon be introduced in this House. In that bill we shall attempt to define "civil war", a term which requires study and consideration by the committee. Time has not permitted us to go beyond the immediate crisis.

I trust that this resolution passes without amendment, so as to save the necessity of conference with the Senate. Its passage today is imperative. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY].

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I asked this 1 minute to read an amendment I intend to offer:

Strike out paragraph 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Therefore be it resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That due to the existence of a state of war, civil, or other strife obtaining in any foreign country it shall, from and after the approval of this resolution, be unlawful to export

arms, munitions, or implements of war from any place in the United States or possessions of the United States to any foreign country or for transshipment from any neutral or belligerent foreign country to a foreign country where a state of war, civil, or other strife, now exists."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional half minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY].

Mr. CONNERY. Paragraph 2 relating to licenses heretofore issued under existing law is left in the bill, but my amendment amends paragraph 2, in line 2, by striking out the word "Spain" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "any foreign country."

This will do what we who want to prevent any shipment of arms and ammunition to any foreign country desire, and do it right away. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. AMLIE].

Mr. AMLIE. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the amendment that has been proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] is fully adequate. It will make of this resolution an adequate statement of neutrality policy.

As the resolution stands at the present time it is an unneutral act. It constitutes an unfriendly act toward a government that is friendly to the United States. Not long ago a newspaperman wrote that the significant thing about this strife in Spain was the fact that all of the world was taking sides in that contest. This is particularly true of the governments of European countries and of the classes in European countries. It is true, of course, of individuals as well.

It seems to me that at this time we ought not to take sides but ought, rather, to adopt a well-defined and adequate neutrality policy. I have been struck the last few weeks by the fact that Members of this body and Members of another legislative body, who have not distinguished themselves by their efforts in behalf of neutrality legislation, have been quoted by the press as to what they would do to prevent shipments of arms from this country to the regularly constituted Government of Spain. These people are not interested in maintaining the neutrality of the United States. These people are pro-Fascist, and they would like to have the United States take a stand that would help the Rebel-Fascist forces of Spain.

As far as I am concerned, I believe that George Washington, in his Farewell Address, enunciated a foreign policy for the United States that we would do well to follow. If we adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts this resolution will then constitute an adequate and far-reaching statement of foreign policy applicable in all cases, and not open to the charge that it is designed to injure a friendly nation. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, having heard the President 2 hours ago speak about the intrinsic rights of democracies to defend themselves, it is with a sad feeling that I vote upon this proposition before the House today. But it will undoubtedly pass. I wish, however, to leave this one thought with this body and with the esteemed chairman of the committee in charge of the resolution, from the group that I represent politically and economically, that before this Congress adjourns the proper committee bring up for consideration a bill providing for Government ownership of the munitions industry of this country. Be basic, be sound. The only way we can control this traffic is not by such resolutions as we are now considering but by smashing the munitions ring in this country and giving the people of the United States a program that will end the need for such hasty legislation as we are now considering. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, there is no disposition on the part of the Republican minority to delay, obstruct, or hamper the majority in the passage of this bill. We recognize that this

is an emergency measure, that it has for its purpose the preservation of peace, and keeping the United States out of war by preventing the selling of munitions and implements of war to either side in the civil war in Spain.

We as a minority regret that it is necessary for the House of Representatives to rush through legislation of this importance without adequate debate. It so happens that in the other body they struck out the entire preamble. Some of the Members of the House, including myself, spoke to a number of the Senators when the Senators were here a few hours ago at the joint session and suggested that this be done. It might well have happened that we would have passed the resolution containing the preamble. The preamble practically recognizes a state of belligerency by the Congress in Spain, yet our State Department has failed to issue any proclamation of belligerency or insurgency. The adoption of the preamble by Congress would have virtually declared a state of belligerency to exist in Spain, instead of such proclamation coming from the President or from the State Department, and would have established an unfortunate precedent for future administrations absolutely contrary to international custom and tradition.

I am in sympathy with the purposes of this joint resolution. As I previously stated, I regret there is not adequate debate provided to discuss the bill intelligently and the present conditions in Spain. The resolution amounts to a complete change of the policy of the United States. If I am wrong in the statement I am about to make, I wish some Member would correct me.

As I recollect it, the Congress some years ago authorized the Chief Executive to permit the shipment of arms to de facto governments in South and Central America. In other words, we prohibited the shipment of arms to the insurgents or to the rebels against the existing governments in Central and South America.

We are now making a complete about-face in this resolution as far as Spain is concerned, which is the de facto or recognized government, as we have failed to recognize the insurgents, and provide that the Spanish Government shall not be allowed to buy arms and munitions of war in the United States. However, I favor the policy outlined in this bill because I think it is a step in the direction of peace and that we should not sell arms or munitions of war to either side. It is immaterial to me whether the bill passes in the form it is in or as amended by the gentleman from Massachusetts, as in either form it covers the object we have in view.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman stated this is a matter of policy of several hundred years. Is it not a fact that old policy got us into the most destructive war of all time a few years ago?

Mr. FISH. The gentleman did not understand what I said. I stated as far as civil wars were concerned, it initiated a new policy. I am heartily in favor of this bill, and I think a great victory has been won in the House today because the Democratic floor leader and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs have both stated publicly that when the permanent neutrality bill comes up for consideration it will come up under general debate so that the Members of the House may take part in the debate, discuss the bill on its merits, and offer amendments. I take this occasion to emphasize that one of the worst things that happened in the last Congress was the fact that the important neutrality bill was brought up for consideration in the House of Representatives, which is supposed to be a great deliberative body, and jammed through under a gag rule which provided for only 20 minutes debate on each side, with no right to amend. We have the assurance given us today that when the permanent neutrality bill comes up for consideration within the next month that adequate opportunity will be provided for the offering of amendments and there will be ample general debate. [Applause.]

This is an emergency measure, and we on our side do not propose to play politics with it for partisan reasons. I am

sure that most of the Republican Members will support the bill in its present form, or as amended, in order to stop the sale of American munitions to both sides in Spain, for the sake of war profits and blood money.

I think the gentleman from Texas made the statement that this bill goes farther than the wording of the bill indicates. It is not merely a question of stopping the shipment of arms and munitions of war to the different factions in Spain. The whole world at the present time is filled with rumors of war and is on the verge of a world war that may start in Spain at any moment.

We have to determine our neutrality policy. We have to determine now whether we will sacrifice war profits and blood money in order to keep out of these wars. I think that is the desire and will of the American people at this time. You can almost hear the beating of the wings of the Angel of Death as it hovers over Spain tonight or France, Germany, China, Japan, or Soviet Russia. We peace-loving Americans have to determine whether we will sacrifice the war profits that dragged us into the last war by adopting a strict, permanent neutrality policy prohibiting the sale and shipment of arms and munitions of war to all belligerent countries. As one who served in the World War and as one who loathes and abhors wars, I am in favor of stopping the sale of munitions of war to all belligerent nations and civil-war factions within a nation.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield in reference to that civil-war proposition?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman for a brief question.

Mr. RANKIN. In 1930 the old policy that we had come within a hair's breadth of getting us involved in a war with Brazil because the then administration permitted the shipment of munitions of war to the people of Brazil at a time when a revolution was on and it came very near drawing us into a war in South America.

Mr. FISH. I may say to the gentleman I am for this bill although it changes our traditional policy with reference to shipment of arms where civil war exists. Everyone on our committee who has examined the bill appreciates it is a step in the right direction toward keeping the United States out of war.

We were forced into the late World War against our will by the attack of German submarines on our vessels without warning. We did not want to go into that war, but we were forced into it, and we have now made up our minds, or at least the American people have, to stay out of all foreign entanglements and wars. There is nothing the Congress can do that would keep us out of war, as congressional resolutions are not sufficient.

The only people who can keep us out of war are the American people back home; and they have made up their minds that they will not go to war for the sake of war profit and for the sake of the war profiteers. If we are going to have another war, it must be in defense of the United States of America and not in defense of war profiteers, the munition makers, or foreign nations. [Applause.]

Mr. HOOK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. Is it not a fact the only effective way to have neutrality is to stop the private interests from manufacturing munitions of war?

Mr. FISH. I am not going to argue the question with the gentleman at this time. I have stated many times on the floor of the House that I am prepared to vote for Government ownership or regulation of the manufacture of munitions of war in the United States, which is the surest way to take the profit out of war. [Applause.] I want to serve notice on the Democratic majority that while we are only talking about the civil war in Spain, horrible and bloody as it is, that the people back home are much more interested in our own safety and in keeping the United States of America out of all wars. What have you done on that side to pass the American Legion's universal service draft bill which would draft capital, industry, labor, and the veterans on an equal basis in case of a future war? If you want to keep the United States out of war, take the

profits out of war and pass the Legion bill along with the permanent neutrality bill next month.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman knows very well when we had that bill up for consideration in this House the Democratic majority would have passed it except the bill was drawn for the protection of capital, and labor was very much restricted.

Mr. FISH. No; do not blame the House. The House passed it and the Senate held it up. That is past history. Let us unite and get speedy and favorable action at this session.

Mr. CONNERY. Yes; but we changed it. We cut out that amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will yield, I will tell the gentleman one thing we have done on this side. We have taxed the profits of the last war that will help to keep us out of the next one.

Mr. FISH. I think we are all agreed and have made up our minds that this country is going to keep out of war no matter what happens in any other nation of the world. If the other nations of the world insist on arming to the teeth and going to war, it is their war and not ours. We are prepared to spend millions for defense, but not one dollar to send an American soldier over to foreign lands to fight other people's battles. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as a great American once said, "It is a condition and not a theory that confronts us."

In my opinion we should pass this resolution, as written, at the earliest possible moment, and by a roll-call vote, in order to let the American people and the world know just how strongly the Congress of the United States favors keeping us out of a foreign war. I agree that this policy ought to be carried further to apply to the entire world and I am willing to support legislation to that end at any time.

I agree with the gentleman who stated a few moments ago that there ought not to be any more private enterprises manufacturing munitions of war. I have felt that for years, because I believe the munitions manufacturers and the international financiers have done more to drag us into war than everything else put together.

Let me say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], who talks about reversing the policy of 150 years, that I do not care if we are reversing the policy of a thousand years if it will keep us out of the holocaust of war now going on in Spain. The people of the world are not thinking of technicalities. But when they look across the sea and behold helpless women and children ruthlessly killed with poison gases in the streets of Madrid or blown to pieces in the Alcazar, they shudder with horror. Our people expect us to keep them out of such a conflict. Remember, this is the way we started getting into the World War, through these munitions manufacturers and other people who were willing to endanger the peace of our country in order to coin their millions from the blood and tears of the suffering men, women, and children of the world.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] asked what we had done to promote peace. Let me tell him what his administration did in 1930. A civil war broke out in Brazil—justified, in my opinion—and right in the midst of that conflict, in October 1930, the Hoover administration lifted the embargo on arms to the Brazilian nationals and authorized the sale to them of airplanes and other munitions that were being manufactured for the United States Army and Navy, and sent an American battleship into Brazilian waters, and in that way came within a hair's breadth of plunging us into a war with the people of Brazil—which might have involved us in war with all of Latin America.

When that battleship showed up at Rio de Janeiro, the entire army, navy, and marine corps of Brazil went over to the rebels, took Washington Louis, the then President of

Brazil, and put him in jail, and wired Mr. Vargas, the rebel leader, and who is now President of that country, to come to Rio de Janeiro and take command.

Now, if the gentleman wants to know what we have done to keep out of a war of this kind, I call his attention to the fact that we narrowly escaped a war with the entire Spanish-speaking world in 1930 because the Hoover administration failed to do then what the Roosevelt administration is trying to do now.

The gentleman talks about what we have done about taking the profits out of the next war. We have been trying to tax the profits of the last war. If his party had started in at the time the war closed, or when they took control of the Government in 1921, on a policy of taxing the profits made out of the last war, and made those who got rich out of it understand that wars were not to get rich from, you could not only have balanced the Budget and paid a large part of the national debt, but you would have served notice on these greedy munitions manufacturers and financiers that they were not going to sacrifice the American people in foreign wars in order to make for themselves millions or billions of paltry dollars at the sacrifice of millions of human lives in the years to come.

I sincerely trust that this measure will pass without amendment. We can amend later. This is an emergency. I also hope that we may have a roll call on its final passage.

Let us register our voices now so that the 130,000,000 people back home may understand that we are going to keep them out of any foreign wars, if it is humanly possible to do so. [Applause.]

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL].

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker and Members, back in other days I have sent men to the electric chair, but I have always doubted whether the Government should have that authority.

There has been a galaxy of splendid gentlemen voicing their opposition today, and I wondered whether or not they felt like they were sitting as a jury passing on the lives of men and women they never saw and of whose quarrels they have no part.

I say, let Germany's and Russia's babies in Spain fight it out; they have violated every rule of civilized warfare.

I wish to say that I am in great doubt after listening to the gentleman who has control of one-half of the time on that side, who says he is for the measure but allots time to men who offer various thoughts and reasons why the legislation should not be passed.

One gentleman thought that we should wait until we had a war with Mexico before passing this emergency legislation. Nine million dollars' worth of munitions will kill lots of men and women.

As Members we are deciding on the lives of men, and I would want to go to sleep without being guilty of these objectionable tactics which, if they prevailed, would cause no legislation today and perhaps not tomorrow.

I wish I could present to these men the picture of all the legless and armless men, the widows and orphans, and the funeral processions that will be the result of these \$9,000,000 worth of bombs dropped upon them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take the remainder of the time, but shall use only a minute. This bill passed in the Senate by a vote of 80 to nothing. It is necessary that it be passed just as it is. If it is not, it means delay, and we do not know what might happen in that event. Therefore I hope that all amendments will be voted down.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, is it not a fact that in the Senate the vote was recorded by roll call?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I have been so informed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is the fact.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution for amendment.

The Clerk reported the resolution.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONNERY: Page 1, strike out all after the resolving clause in paragraph 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That during the existence of a state of war, civil or other strife, obtaining in any foreign country, it shall from and after the approval of this resolution be unlawful to export arms, ammunition, or implements of war from any place in the United States, or possessions of the United States, to any foreign country or for transshipment from any neutral or belligerent foreign country to a foreign country where a state of war, civil or other strife, now exists. Arms, ammunition, or implements of war, the exportation of which is prohibited by this resolution, are those enumerated in the President's proclamation, no. 2163, of April 10, 1936."

Paragraph 2, line 2, strike out the word "Spain" and insert in lieu thereof the words "any foreign country."

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the amendment. The resolution under consideration provides a prohibition against the shipment of arms to Spain. It is not in order to substitute other countries. Therefore the amendment is not germane.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection until I can make a statement?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I rather expected that a point of order would be made against the amendment; but there is no other way that I can find whereby we can get what we want to do in this matter except by the amendment that I have offered. In other words, I do not believe there is any language that could be written which would apply to the entire world as an amendment to this resolution. The resolution is confined to Spain; and when we try to extend it to the rest of the world, I suppose the point of order will lie. But I should like to have my friend the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee withdraw the point of order and give the House of Representatives a chance to vote on this amendment. Let us find out how the House feels about this legislation.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I advise the gentleman that he will have a chance to vote on that matter later.

Mr. CONNERY. I mean in the present temper of the House. Of course, if the point of order lies to this or any other similar amendment, or if proposed amendments be defeated, I say to the gentleman from Tennessee that I intend to vote for the resolution, but I should like to have the gentleman give the House a chance to express itself on how it stands today in respect to all foreign countries and not just as to Spain. Why not serve notice on the entire world today that the Congress of the United States is saying to the world that we will not mix into foreign entanglements or into their wars, whether they be civil or wars between foreign countries? Why not give the House a chance to express itself by vote? If the House does not want that at this time, if the House feels that it does not want to vote on general neutrality legislation until later, well and good; but why not give the House a chance to vote now and not press the point of order? It is a clear-cut issue.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire to discuss the point of order?

Mr. CONNERY. Merely to say, Mr. Speaker, in reference to the point of order, that after studying it carefully I fear that the point of order lies.

The SPEAKER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. It has always been surprising to me, during the last 4 years, that when the question of neutrality has come up we are always placed in the position of doing a little bit of our duty instead of our entire duty. I believe that we can accept the challenge of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL], who spoke a short while ago and who suggested that this question be put to a referendum of the people of a certain district. I might broaden that challenge and say that if the people of the United States had a chance to express by referendum whether they want the embargo placed on the shipment of arms to all countries or just to Spain, we may be sure how they would vote. The point of order has been made against opening this thing up and expressing the policy of the Government of the United

States. I thought when I listened to the President that the policy of the Government of the United States is to say to every other nation in the world "When you engage in armed conflict, when you settle your affairs through the use of arms, we will not help you one bit, you can get nothing from us." That is what I think the policy of the United States is. I do not think the policy of our Government is to say to Spain alone, "When you violate the rules of civilized man we will not help you." Why do we have to wait until tomorrow to state that policy, or until next week or a month from now? Who is here in this House who is so sure that he may be here tomorrow? There are some of us who believe we may not be here, and I think when the duty is put before us that we can express what the people want here and now instead of at some future date. Why frustrate, why forestall the people of the United States by invoking parliamentary procedure? Why delay the people of the United States from expressing their opinion upon armed conflict and the shipment of arms to warring nations? They say some of us are delaying this bill by demanding debate and offering improving amendments. Debate is good. We ought to have enough debate to put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of those rascally Americans who are trying to make money off armed conflict—who think more of profits than the lives of fellow human beings.

We ought to put their names and their profits in the RECORD. We ought to hold them up to public disapproval by publication of their dirty trade in blood and tears. They ought to be run out of the country and deprived of their citizenship. That is what debate will do and exposition of the subject will help to do. This is why some of us want to open this up, so that the people of the United States will have a chance, through their Representatives, to say whether they want to pick out one country to try a neutrality policy on or have it apply to all countries and against all shippers or makers of arms and munitions.

I hope the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House will not use what he has a right to use, what we all admit he has a right to use, namely, the rules of this House, to prevent the Members of this House from trying to do what they think their people want them to do. I plead with him to withdraw the point of order and to not make points of order against amendments which will give us a chance to say for our people that we want this Government to stop shipping arms and ammunition to any and every country in the world, either during peace or during war. To frustrate the House and the people with parliamentary objections is to defeat the policy of complete neutrality which the chairman and the committee say they favor so strongly. Let us get an amendment in this bill that will show the country and the world that this law is not aimed just at Spain but applies to all countries from now on. If we do today what the Democratic Party promised in its platform—neutrality and peace legislation—tomorrow can take care of itself and neither the Congress nor the American people will have to rely on promises of what may be done in the future.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAVERICK: In line 4, strike out the words "now obtaining in Spain it shall"; in line 7, strike out "to Spain or to"; in the same line, strike out the word "other"; in line 8, strike out the words "for transshipment to Spain or for use of either of the opposing forces in Spain"; after line 16, strike out the remainder of the resolution.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, at that point I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may read the resolution as it will read with my amendment.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read the resolution as it would read if amended by the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That during the existence of the state of civil strife from and after the approval of this resolution it shall be unlawful to export arms, ammunition, or implements of war from any place in the United States, or possessions of the United States, to any foreign country.

Arms, ammunition, or implements of war, the exportation of which is prohibited by this resolution are those enumerated in the President's proclamation no. 2163 of April 10, 1936.

Licenses heretofore issued under existing law for the exportation of arms, ammunition, or implements of war to Spain shall, as to all future exportations thereunder, ipso facto be deemed to be canceled.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I raise the same point of order which I made to the previous amendment. The gentleman from Texas is trying to do in a different way what was ruled out a while ago.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to discuss the point of order?

Mr. MAVERICK. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Texas on the point of order.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I have never known of any rule that would prohibit the striking out of any portion of a paragraph. In other words, it has always been considered proper to strike out portions of any particular paragraph. If it happens to change the meaning of the resolution, that simply happens by virtue of striking out those words.

I simply propose in one paragraph to strike out the words "now obtaining in Spain", and then I say "for transshipment to Spain"; but I call attention to the fact that what I have proposed is absolutely germane, because it still provides that all licenses heretofore issued to Spain shall be canceled under such and such a resolution. In other words, certain portions that refer to Spain are stricken out, and all the rest of it is left in. I have not put in a single word. I have simply stricken out certain words.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order made by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Chair undertook to pay particular heed to the language of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK], and is of the opinion, for the reason which the Chair will presently state, that the point of order against the amendment is well taken.

The Chair calls the attention of the gentleman from Texas to what the Chair regards as a decision somewhat on all-fours with the question presented here. Of course, this question of germaneness often presents difficulties to a presiding officer, either the Speaker or a Chairman of the Committee of the Whole; but the Chair thinks that a long line of precedents clearly establishes the practice of the House upon questions of this sort.

In the opinion of the Chair this amendment is not germane to the original resolution which is now under consideration under the precedent to which the Chair now calls attention:

An amendment which, by striking out a portion of the text, changes the purpose and scope of a bill, is not germane.

Now, what is the purpose and scope of the Senate resolution which is under consideration? There can be no controversy that it relates entirely to the question of the shipment of arms and ammunition to Spain—one particular country—and regulates certain phases of shipments to warring civil factions in that country; but under the suggestion made in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas it certainly departs entirely from the limitation with reference to the shipment of munitions to the one Government of Spain, and broadens the field so as to apply to any government.

Under the decision which the Chair has cited, the Chair sustains the point of order.

LEGS, ARMS, AND GUTS—BUT WHAT ABOUT NEUTRALITY?

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, one of the Members talked about the legs and the arms of the poor people being killed over in Spain. In my opinion, as I understand it, that is a lot of nonsense, because I have seen a lot of legs and arms rotting

on the fields of France. I have had guts of dead men thrown in my face. I do not like to mention such things, but the words I heard had nothing to do with the subject we are discussing. If we are to discuss dead men, I can talk as long as any man on the floor. Let us talk about the resolution, and references to "dilatatory tactics" are silly. This is a parliamentary government.

But what I like about this more than anything else is that we have at last got initial recognition from the Democratic Party that we are going to consider neutrality. I do not want to criticize the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS], but I am rather of the opinion that this neutrality matter has been handled from the start in a more or less arbitrary manner, as though possibly we were not intelligent enough to listen to speeches and weigh them.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY MUST BE DEMOCRATIC

We ought to discuss this subject and we ought to discuss it fully. I do not charge the gentleman from Tennessee with a breach of faith, but we were told that when the subject of neutrality came up it would be under an open rule and it would be given full consideration; but points of order have been made and we have been stopped from real consideration.

Let us review a little. Our memories are short. Thank God for that, but only last year we were sobbing over "poor Abyssinia." Yet now we have forgotten all about Abyssinia. The flag of Italy flies over Abyssinia now, and it is all over. It makes no personal difference to me. I am mighty glad, however, those who favor neutrality have gotten a little recognition, but may I say that if the Democratic Party expects to continue its successful career it must be democratic and listen to the views of its members.

PROFITS OUT OF WAR—NEUTRALITY—MUNITIONS' INTEREST

I listened with great interest to the President of the United States in his address today and I liked what he said about the Supreme Court; I liked almost everything he said. We know that the President has tremendous power, that the Democratic Party has tremendous power, too. Let us see that we use this power in a democratic way. Let me say to the leaders of the Democratic Party that we have not passed any bill taking the profits out of war. We have made a failure of that, and we might as well face the country with it. That is the first thing.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield.

Mr. LUDLOW. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the Democratic national platform adopted in Philadelphia contains a very forward-looking plank on this subject of peace and international relations, in which it declared in favor of taking the profits out of war.

We are in the surges of one of the greatest peace movements America ever has known—a peace movement that reached high tide when the delegates to the Democratic national convention, interpreting the longing that is in the hearts of our people—North, East, South, and West—wrote into the Democratic national platform last year one of the most comprehensive and definite pledges on the subject of war and peace ever offered to the people of this Nation. That plank is a sacred covenant between the Democratic Party and the people of the United States, and if we who are elected to positions of high authority on that platform fail to meet our responsibilities under it, I will agree that there is no virtue and honor left among men.

Let me, by quoting the text of that plank, remind the House and the country of the kind of peace action we are pledged to by its terms. The plank adopted at Philadelphia is as follows:

We reaffirm our opposition to war as an instrument of national policy and declare that disputes between nations should be settled by peaceful means. We shall continue to observe a true neutrality in the disputes of others; to be prepared resolutely to resist aggression against ourselves; to work for peace, and to take the profit out of war; to guard against being drawn by political commitments, international banking, or private trading into any war which may develop anywhere.

That plank is not couched in weasel words. It is as positive and definite as a promissory note, and the sooner we

begin to carry out our covenant with the people and the more good faith we manifest in the performance, the better it will be for our reputations. In that plank we have a positively definite pledge by the Democratic Party to take the profit out of war.

Take the profit out of war and there will be few wars. I join my distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK] in his lamentation over the fact that though the Democratic Party, to which he and I belong, has been in full power and lord of all it surveyed for 4 years, it has done nothing to take the profit out of war; but I have high hope that under the incentive and impulse of the Philadelphia platform we shall make our amends to the people of this country at the present session by adopting and starting on its way to ratification a constitutional amendment to take the profit out of war. On yesterday, the opening day of Congress, I introduced such an amendment.

My proposed constitutional amendment also provides for a Nation-wide referendum before war can be declared, the only exception being in case of attack or invasion. My resolution, known as House Joint Resolution 20, is based on the philosophy that those who have to suffer and, if need be, to die and to bear the awful burdens and costs of war shall have something to say as to whether war shall be declared. I sincerely believe that if my proposed constitutional amendment is adopted it will be the means of preventing our boys from being dragged into slaughter pens in foreign countries, to be mown down by machine guns or blown to bits by bombs rained from the skies, to be horribly strangled by poison gases, or to die an agonizing death from disease germs hellishly spawned in foreign laboratories. I believe that if this amendment is adopted America will never enter another foreign war in the settlement of other peoples' quarrels, and perhaps will never enter another war of any kind, unless the need should come to wage a righteous war of self-defense.

In proposing this amendment I am honored by the support of the gentleman whom I have interrupted to submit these observations, a gentleman who has gone through the fire of war, one of the finest soldiers and one of the best citizens of America, MAURY MAVERICK.

In conclusion, I want to say that under the peace plank of the Philadelphia platform we are amply justified in the action we are about to take when we adopt this resolution cutting off the shipment of munitions to Spain. The genius who wrote the Philadelphia plank must have had prophetic vision, for you will note that it places the Democratic Party "on guard against being drawn by * * * private trading into any war which may develop anywhere." The very thought that there are men in America who would run the risk of plunging America into war for the sake of filthy dollars is enough to sicken the heart of long-suffering humanity. The adoption of the pending resolution is necessary to curb this gentry; but this is only the beginning, and a very small beginning at that, of the peace program we must enact if we keep faith with the people of America.

WE SHOULD FOLLOW DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM

Mr. MAVERICK. The gentleman from Indiana calls attention to the fact that the Democratic platform adopted in Philadelphia contained such a plank. We have so far failed; let us make a success—and enact effective legislation on that.

The next matter to which I direct the attention of the Democratic Party is neutrality. We did not adopt a sufficiently comprehensive bill at the last session. We might as well do it now. We have been letting the American people live on promises.

The next criticism is that we still have private ownership of the munitions interests. As others have said, the only effective way to control the manufacture of munitions is to put it under public ownership. All of these matters should receive our wholehearted, intelligent support. Let us keep this country out of war—take out the profits, observe neutrality, and halt the munitions racket. Let us do a good job. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the passage of the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the Senate joint resolution.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read the third time, and was read the third time.

(The text of the resolution will be found printed in full on p. 90.)

Mr. RANKIN and Mr. KOPPLEMANN demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 406, nays 1, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 3]

YEAS—411

Aleshire	Delaney	Hill, Ala.	May
Allen, Del.	Dempsey	Hill, Okla.	Mead
Allen, Ill.	DeMuth	Hill, Wash.	Meeks
Allen, La.	DeRouen	Hoffman	Merritt
Allen, Pa.	Dickstein	Holmes	Michener
Amle	Dies	Honeyman	Millard
Anderson, Mo.	Dingell	Hook	Miller
Andresen, Minn.	Dirksen	Hope	Mills
Andrews	Disney	Houston	Mitchell, Ill.
Arends	Ditter	Hull	Mitchell, Tenn.
Arnold	Dixon	Hunter	Moser, Pa.
Ashbrook	Dockweiler	Imhoff	Mosier, Ohio
Atkinson	Dondero	Izac	Mouton
Bacon	Dorsey	Jacobsen	Murdock, Ariz.
Barden	Doughton	Jarman	Murdock, Utah
Barry	Dowell	Jarrett	Nelson
Bates	Doxey	Jenckes, Ind.	Nichols
Beam	Drew, Pa.	Jenkins, Ohio	Norton
Belter	Drewry, Va.	Jenks, N. H.	O'Brien, Ill.
Bell	Driver	Johnson, Minn.	O'Brien, Mich.
Biermann	Duncan	Johnson, Okla.	O'Connell, Mont.
Bigelow	Eaton	Johnson, Tex.	O'Connell, R. I.
Binderup	Eberharter	Johnson, W. Va.	O'Connor, Mont.
Bland	Eckert	Jones	O'Connor, N. Y.
Bloom	Edmiston	Keller	O'Day
Boehne	Elcher	Kelly, Ill.	O'Leary
Boileau	Ellenbogen	Kelly, N. Y.	O'Malley
Boland, Pa.	Engel	Kennedy, Md.	O'Neal, Ky.
Boren	Evans	Kennedy, N. Y.	O'Neill, N. J.
Boyer	Faddis	Kenney	O'Toole
Boykin	Farley	Keogh	Oliver
Boylan, N. Y.	Ferguson	Kerr	Owen
Bradley	Fernandez	Kinzer	Pace
Brewster	Fish	Kirwan	Palmisano
Brooks	Fitzgerald	Kitchens	Parsons
Brown	Fitzpatrick	Kieberg	Patrick
Buchanan	Flannagan	Kloeb	Patterson
Buck	Flannery	Kniffin	Patton
Buckler, Minn.	Fieger	Knutson	Pearson
Burch	Fletcher	Kocialkowski	Peterson, Fla.
Burdick	Focht	Kopplemann	Peterson, Ga.
Byrne	Forand	Kramer	Pettengill
Caldwell	Ford, Calif.	Lambertson	Peyser
Cannon, Mo.	Ford, Miss.	Lambeth	Pfeifer
Cannon, Wis.	Frey, Pa.	Lamneck	Phillips
Carlson	Fries, Ill.	Lanham	Pierce
Carter	Fuller	Larrabee	Plumley
Cartwright	Fulmer	Lea	Poage
Case, S. Dak.	Gambrill	Leavy	Polk
Celler	Garrett	Lemke	Powers
Champion	Gasque	Lesinski	Quinn
Chandler	Gavagan	Lewis, Colo.	Rabaut
Chapman	Gearhart	Lewis, Md.	Ramsay
Church	Gehrmann	Long	Ramspeck
Citron	Gifford	Lord	Randolph
Clark, Idaho	Gilchrist	Lucas	Rankin
Clark, N. C.	Gildea	Luze	Rayburn
Clason	Gingery	Luckey, Nebr.	Reece, Tenn.
Claypool	Goldsborough	Ludlow	Reed, Ill.
Cluett	Gray, Ind.	Luecke, Mich.	Reed, N. Y.
Cochran	Gray, Pa.	McAndrews	Rees, Kans.
Coffee, Nebr.	Green	McClellan	Reilly
Coffee, Wash.	Greenwood	McCormack	Rich
Colden	Greever	McFarlane	Richards
Cole, Md.	Gregory	McGehee	Rigney
Collins	Griffith	McGranery	Robertson
Colmer	Griswold	McGrath	Robison, Ky.
Conner	Guyer	McGroarty	Rogers, Mass.
Cooley	Gwynne	McKeough	Rogers, Okla.
Cooper	Haines	McLaughlin	Romjue
Costello	Halleck	McMillan	Rutherford
Cox	Hamilton	McReynolds	Ryan
Crawford	Hancock, N. Y.	McSweeney	Sabath
Creal	Hancock, N. C.	Maas	Sacks
Crosby	Harrington	Magnuson	Sadowski
Crosser	Hart	Mahon, S. C.	Sanders
Crowe	Harter	Mahon, Tex.	Sauthoff
Crowther	Hartley	Maloney	Schaefer, Ill.
Culkin	Havener	Mapes	Schneider, Wis.
Cullen	Healey	Martin, Colo.	Schuetz
Cummings	Hendricks	Martin, Mass.	Schulte
Curley	Hennings	Mason	Scott
Daly	Higgins	Massingale	Scrugham
Deen	Hildebrandt	Maverick	Secret

Seger	Starnes	Thompson, III.	Welch
Shafer, Mich.	Steagall	Thurston	Wene
Shanley	Stefan	Tinkham	West
Shannon	Sullivan	Tobey	Whelchel
Sheppard	Summers, Tex.	Tolan	White, Idaho
Short	Sutphin	Towey	White, Ohio
Sirovich	Sweeney	Transue	Whittington
Smith, Conn.	Swope	Treadway	Wigglesworth
Smith, Maine	Taber	Turner	Wilcox
Smith, Va.	Tarver	Umstead	Williams
Smith, Wash.	Taylor, Colo.	Vinson, Ga.	Withrow
Smith, W. Va.	Taylor, S. C.	Vinson, Ky.	Wolcott
Snell	Taylor, Tenn.	Voorhis	Wolfenden
Snyder, Pa.	Telgan	Wadsworth	Wolverton
Somers, N. Y.	Terry	Wallgren	Woodruff
South	Thom	Walter	Woodrum
Sparkman	Thomas, N. J.	Warren	Zimmerman
Spence	Thomas, Tex.	Wearin	The Speaker
Stack	Thomason, Tex.	Weaver	

NAYS—1

Bernard

NOT VOTING—22

Buckley, N. Y.	Dunn	Kvale	Patman
Bulwinkle	Englebright	Lanzetta	Robinson, Utah
Casey, Mass.	Goodwin	McLean	Stubbs
Cole, N. Y.	Harlan	Mansfield	Wood
Cravens	Hobbs	Montague	
Douglas	Kee	Mott	

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. BANKHEAD, and he answered "aye."

So the Senate joint resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. McLean.
Mr. Dunn with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Harlan with Mr. Mott.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Englebright.
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Montague with Mr. Kvale.
Mr. Robinson of Utah with Mr. Wood.
Mr. Casey of Massachusetts with Mr. Stubbs.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. McREYNOLDS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

ENROLLMENT OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 3

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that notwithstanding the adjournment or recess of the House the Speaker be, and he is hereby, authorized to sign the enrolled joint resolution of the Senate, Senate Joint Resolution No. 3.

The motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement which I made public recently.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. JENCKES of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend her own remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday next, after the reading of the Journal and disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER laid before the House report of the House Select Committee on the Reorganization of Government Ac-

tivities, which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. McLEAN (at the request of Mr. POWERS), on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that I know of on the calendar and no business that could be transacted tomorrow. The President has expressed the wish to send his Budget message to the House on Friday; therefore we will have to meet on that day. I may say to the Members for their convenience, however, that it is the intention on Friday to do nothing except receive the President's Budget message.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn until Friday.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Friday, January 8, 1937, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

151. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting the Annual Report of the National Munitions Control Board in compliance of Joint Resolution No. 67, Seventy-fourth Congress, 1935 (H. Doc. No. 10); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

152. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report of the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital showing in detail the expenditures of the hospital for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1936; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

153. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury Department, transmitting a report of expenditures made in connection with Pershing Hall in Paris, France; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

154. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury Department, transmitting a report of the receipts and expenditures made during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, from the working capital fund established for the operation of the industrial activities at the United States Public Health Service Hospital, Lexington, Ky.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

155. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury Department, transmitting a report of rental collections on account of public buildings and sites, privileges, and ground rent under the control of the Treasury Department outside of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1936; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

156. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury Department, transmitting reports from the Departments of Commerce, War, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the General Accounting Office relative to money received during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1936, which was not paid into the general fund of the United States Treasury; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

157. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury Department, transmitting a statement of the receipts and expenditures, balances, etc., of the Government during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1936; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

158. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury Department, transmitting a report showing refunds of

internal revenue in excess of \$500 approved by the Bureau of Internal Revenue during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1936; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

159. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a list of suits arising under the act of March 9, 1920 (41 Stat. 525); to the Committee on Claims.

160. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a list of suits arising under the Public Vessel Act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1112); to the Committee on Claims.

161. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a report for the period from July 1, 1935, to June 30, 1936, both inclusive, giving names of statutory and contingent-fund employees of the House and their respective compensations, including clerks to Members; the expenditures from the contingent fund and from certain specific appropriations; to the Committee on Accounts.

162. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1936, concerning the Federal-aid work administered by the Bureau of Public Roads; to the Committee on Roads.

163. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the annual report of the Department of Justice for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1936; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

164. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on preliminary examination of Port Ontario Harbor, N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

165. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated January 4, 1937, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on preliminary examination of Port Allen, Hawaii; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

166. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated January 4, 1937, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on preliminary examination of Russian River, Calif.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

167. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated January 4, 1937, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on preliminary examination of ship canal across Prince of Wales Island, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

168. A letter from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Second Annual Report of the Securities and Exchange Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCHANAN: A bill (H. R. 1952) to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever", approved February 28, 1929, by including Roger P. Ames among those honored by said act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 1953) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the original Norfolk (Va.) land grant and the two hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the city of Norfolk, Va., as a borough; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. HILL of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 1954) to prevent profiteering in time of war and to equalize the burdens of war and thus provide for the national defense, and promote peace; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 1955) to increase the processing tax on certain oils, to impose a tax upon imported soybean oil, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCORMACK: A bill (H. R. 1956) to provide for the construction of 10 vessels for the Coast Guard designed for ice-breaking and assistance work; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 1957) to repeal section 603 of the Revenue Act of 1932; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 1958) to amend the World War Adjusted Compensation Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1959) to provide for additional relief for World War veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1960) to amend existing laws pertaining to yearly renewable term and United States Government life insurance; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 1961) to authorize the conveyance by the United States to the State of Wisconsin of a portion of the Twin River Point Light-house Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SECREST: A bill (H. R. 1962) to establish the Bureau of Veterans' Affairs in the Department of the Treasury with the Commissioner of Veterans' Affairs at the head thereof, to abolish the Veterans' Administration and transfer its functions to such Bureau, to adjust and equalize pensions of veterans and widows and dependents of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 1963) granting a pension to widows and dependent children of World War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1964) to authorize the appropriation of \$100,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to locate and construct through the States of Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, and West Virginia, and the District of Columbia, a highway to be known as Eastern National Park-to-Park Highway; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1965) to provide for the erection of a monument in honor of the soldiers buried in the churchyard of Washington Church, Knox County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1966) to amend an act known as the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 so as to provide that the Tennessee Valley Authority reimburse certain counties on account of loss of taxable values, and keep equalized the county indebtedness therein; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1967) to amend Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1968) for the protection of subcontractors, labor, and materials employed in public works; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1969) to authorize the prompt deportation of criminals and certain other aliens, to guard against the separation from their families of certain law-abiding aliens, to further restrict immigration into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1970) to reimburse veterans of the Spanish-American War and others; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1971) to provide for the general welfare by establishing a system of Federal subsidies which will enable each State to better cooperate in a Nation-wide program of soil conservation and preservation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURCH: A bill (H. R. 1972) giving superintendents at classified post-office stations credit for substitutes serving under them; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RANDOLPH: A bill (H. R. 1973) to provide for the construction of a post office at Webster Springs, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CANNON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 1974) reducing the membership of the House of Representatives; to the

Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. ALESHIRE: A bill (H. R. 1975) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the expedition of Gen. Benjamin Logan into that territory now known as Logan County, Ohio, and the destruction of the last great Indian stronghold in Ohio; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 1976) to make appropriations for construction at Fort Niagara, N. Y.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1977) to authorize the Secretary of War to lease to Old Fort Niagara Association, Inc., portions of the Fort Niagara Military Reservation, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1978) to authorize an appropriation for construction at Fort Niagara, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 1979) to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station on the shore of Contra Costa County, Calif.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1980) to provide for the registration of aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CHANDLER: A bill (H. R. 1981) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 1982) for the relief of owners of property damaged by high waters in the Blackfoot Reservoir; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1983) to provide a preliminary examination and survey of the Snake River and tributaries in the States of Idaho, Washington, and Oregon, with a view to control of floodwaters; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. COCHRAN: A bill (H. R. 1984) to provide for space in the Federal buildings for employees' credit unions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CONNERY: A bill (H. R. 1985) to limit the effect of the regulation of interstate commerce between the States in goods, wares, and merchandise wholly or in part manufactured, mined, or produced by labor under working conditions, maximum hours, and minimum wages which are illegal in the State of delivery; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DINGELL: A bill (H. R. 1986) to increase to \$20 the maximum Federal grant for matching the monthly old-age-assistance payment made by a State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOCKWEILER: A bill (H. R. 1987) to amend title II of the National Housing Act by adding a new section to be known as section 208; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1988) to amend section 602½ of the Revenue Act of 1934; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGEL: A bill (H. R. 1989) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day, for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GASQUE: A bill (H. R. 1990) granting uniform pensions to widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served the United States in time of peace or war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN: A bill (H. R. 1991) to reenact the law providing for disability allowances for World War veterans and to restore former service-connected disability status; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. IGLESIAS: A bill (H. R. 1992) to make Puerto Rico an incorporated Territory of the United States; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 1993) to prohibit the exportation of tobacco seed and plants, except for experimental purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1994) to provide that payment of adjusted-service credit may be made to the estate of the veteran if no eligible dependent is surviving; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 1995) to add certain lands on the island of Hawaii to the Hawaii National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LAMNECK: A bill (H. R. 1996) to require certain employees of the Postal Service to work on Saturday, and to allow compensatory leave for such work; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1997) to equalize the basis for longevity pay and retirement of warrant officers, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MCGROARTY: A bill (H. R. 1998) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the attorney general of the State of California to bring suit in the Court of Claims on behalf of the Indians of California", approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. L. 602); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 1999) to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by prescribing the conditions under which corporations may engage or may be formed to engage in such commerce, to provide for and define additional powers and duties of the Federal Trade Commission, to assist the several States in improving labor conditions and enlarging purchasing power for goods sold in such commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2000) to extend the civil-service laws, to establish a Federal Personnel Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida: A bill (H. R. 2001) to provide for an investigation and report of losses resulting from the campaign for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruit fly by the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: A bill (H. R. 2002) in furtherance of the neutrality policy of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: A bill (H. R. 2003) for the relief of families of Reserve officers of the Army who die while on active duty with the Civilian Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2004) to authorize the acquisition of land for military purposes at Fort Ethan Allen, Vt.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 2005) to provide additional relief for dependents of deceased World War veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BURCH: A bill (H. R. 2006) to permit certain special-delivery messengers to acquire a classified status through noncompetitive examination; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SHANNON: A bill (H. R. 2007) to establish a holiday to be known as Jefferson's Birthday; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2008) to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a procedure for cost accounting and cost reporting for Federal agencies; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 2009) to make it a crime to advocate, abet, encourage, or otherwise promote the overthrow or the destruction of the Government of the United States by force or violence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2010) to authorize the Secretary of Labor to deport aliens whose presence in the United States is inimical to the public interest; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 2011) to provide for registration of persons employed to advocate or oppose legislative measures and to regulate the method of such advocacy or opposition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH: A bill (H. R. 2012) to adjust the rate of pension to soldiers of the Indian wars who served 90 days or

more in active service against hostile Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2013) relating to the induction of registrants who applied and who were accepted for induction and assigned to educational institutions for special and technical training under the provisions of the act approved August 31, 1918, but whose induction, without fault of their own, was not completed; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILCOX: A bill (H. R. 2014) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Everglades National Park in the State of Florida, and for other purposes", approved May 30, 1934; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 2015) to regulate interstate commerce in bituminous coal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOXEY: A bill (H. R. 2016) to reimburse ginners on account of expenses incurred for the crop year 1934-35 in connection with the Bankhead Cotton Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: A bill (H. R. 2017) to provide for the examination and survey of Town River, at Oxford, Talbot County, Md.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2018) to provide for the examination and survey of Hearn Creek, Dorchester County, Md.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2019) to establish the Federal Monetary Authority and to control the currency of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2020) to restrict chain and branch banking, to amend the National Bank Act and the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LUCKEY of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 2021) to provide time credits for substitutes in the motor-vehicle service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BUCHANAN: Resolution (H. Res. 45) to amend rules 10, 11, and 16; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LAMNECK: Resolution (H. Res. 46) to create a committee of seven Members of the House to make a thorough and complete investigation on the monetary policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McREYNOLDS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 80) to prohibit the exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war from the United States to Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUCHANAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 81) to create a joint congressional committee on Government organization; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GUYER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 82) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 83) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 84) to provide for the preparation, printing, and distribution of pamphlets containing the history of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, Revolutionary War hero, on occasion of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski on October 11, 1929, with certain biographical sketches and explanatory matter; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 85) authorizing the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Brig. Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 86) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the

death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 87) for the erection of a memorial to Dr. Samuel Alexander Mudd; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LEMKE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 88) staying mortgage foreclosures by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and the Farm Credit Administration for a period of 2 years; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCORMACK: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 89) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 90) providing for the sale of postage stamps at places other than the post office or its branches, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 91) to permit a compact or agreement between the States of Idaho and Wyoming respecting the disposition and apportionment of the waters of the Snake River and its tributaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALESHIRE: A bill (H. R. 2022) for the relief of William L. Oden; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2023) for the relief of William G. Sullivan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 2024) granting an increase of pension to Maria A. Houston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2025) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2026) granting an increase of pension to Ernestine Singer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2027) granting an increase of pension to Ada Plattenberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2028) granting a pension to Ethel S. Ferguson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2029) granting a pension to Emma Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2030) granting an increase of pension to Florence A. Clarkson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2031) granting an increase of pension to Henry Friedrich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2032) granting an increase of pension to Martha C. Howe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2033) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Diehl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2034) granting an increase of pension to Anna Flint; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2035) granting a pension to Sarah A. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2036) granting a pension to Lizzie May Schaber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 2037) for the relief of Margaret Mahon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUCHANAN: A bill (H. R. 2038) to authorize the removal of the bar of the statute of limitations with respect to certain taxes paid by Milton Kasch; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUCKLEY of New York: A bill (H. R. 2039) for the relief of James M. D'Arcy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 2040) granting a pension to Edward Myers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2041) for the relief of Kathryn S. Anderson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2042) for the relief of Joshua L. Bach; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2043) for the relief of John W. Elston; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2044) for the relief of Fred Harker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2045) for the relief of Benjamin F. Jones; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2046) for the relief of Albert C. Moe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLUETT: A bill (H. R. 2047) granting a pension to Margaret M. Crane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DINGELL: A bill (H. R. 2048) granting a pension to Henry M. Tunis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DUNCAN: A bill (H. R. 2049) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2050) granting an increase of pension to Lida A. Beverly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2051) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Redman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2052) granting a pension to Mary C. McKarin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2053) granting a pension to Jane S. Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2054) granting a pension to Bertha E. Haroff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2055) granting a pension to Elizabeth Hindman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2056) granting a pension to Sarah C. Burnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2057) granting a pension to Mary F. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2058) granting a pension to Mary C. Wilkerson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2059) granting a pension to Joseph Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2060) granting an increase of pension to Matilda M. Fleming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2061) granting an increase of pension to Rose A. Pettigrew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2062) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2063) granting an increase of pension to Maria Berghoff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2064) granting an increase of pension to Nannie Blades; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ENGEL: A bill (H. R. 2065) granting a pension to Rebecca Barnard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 2066) for the relief of Sylvia I. Whiteman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2067) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Mearkle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2068) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2069) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Laidig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2070) granting a pension to Sadie E. Goshorn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2071) granting a pension to Lillie Haupt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2072) granting a pension to Jacob Franklin Dale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2073) granting a pension to William Cloyd Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2074) granting a pension to Lucretia E. Barton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2075) for the relief of Albert A. Taney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2076) granting a pension to Mary C. Simon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2077) granting a pension to Edna B. Hartley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2078) granting a pension to Minnie G. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULMER: A bill (H. R. 2079) granting an increase of pension to Addison P. M. Martin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2080) for the relief of Eleanora S. Richardson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREENWOOD: A bill (H. R. 2081) granting a pension to Gena Browning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEE: A bill (H. R. 2082) for the relief of F. M. Peters and J. T. Akers; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2083) for the relief of the United Pocahontas Coal Co., Crumpler, W. Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2084) for the relief of the trustees of the Baptist College at Blue Sulphur, W. Va.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2085) for the relief of the widow of Leslie Brandebury Rucker; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2086) for the relief of Henry C. Hale; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KELLY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 2087) for the relief of George O. Kittell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2088) granting a pension to Joseph J. Mann; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2089) for the relief of Charles Weisz; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2090) for the relief of John Knaack; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KLOEB: A bill (H. R. 2091) for the relief of Paul Winters York; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KOCIALKOWSKI: A bill (H. R. 2092) for the relief of Anna Kotnyek; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAMBETH: A bill (H. R. 2093) for the relief of Marion Shober Phillips; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAMNECK: A bill (H. R. 2094) granting an increase of pension to Columbia Hankins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2095) for the relief of Alex Lindsay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2096) for the relief of Roy Beck; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2097) for the relief of Walter Cleo Gibeaut; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2098) for the relief of Agnes Ewing Harter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANHAM: A bill (H. R. 2099) to amend and correct application for copyright filed by Effie Canning Carlton on February 10, 1915, with the Register of Copyrights and bearing renewal registration no. 6384, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN: A bill (H. R. 2100) authorizing the President of the United States to present, in the name of Congress, a medal of honor to Thomas E. Langdon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MASON: A bill (H. R. 2101) for the relief of James Prien; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2102) for the relief of Ida L. Funston; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2103) granting a pension to Clara S. Hopple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2104) granting a pension to Mary E. Todd; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2105) granting a pension to Eva Case; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2106) granting an increase of pension to Charity West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2107) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 2108) for the relief of Dorothy White, Mrs. Carol M. White, and Charles A. White; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH: A bill (H. R. 2109) for the relief of Horatio S. Turrell, alias Horatio Seaward; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2110) for the relief of Charles F. Stone; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2111) for the relief of James J. Orme; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2112) for the relief of Victor D. Maggi; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2113) for the relief of Mark D. Moad; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2114) for the relief of Ernst Nussbaum; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2115) for the relief of George H. Hutchinson, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2116) providing for the advancement on the retired list of the Army of A. W. Barry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 2117) granting a pension to Olive Hancock Entekin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2118) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Borts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2119) granting a pension to Rebecca Leonhardt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2120) granting a pension to Belle Hockensmith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2121) granting a pension to Bettie C. Cunningham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2122) granting a pension to Margaret Wallace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2123) granting a pension to Emma J. Rose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2124) granting a pension to Hattie Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2125) granting a pension to Louisa M. Alcorn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2126) granting a pension to Samantha Midgett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2127) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Huffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2128) granting a pension to G. E. Sandbach; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2129) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Hudgens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2130) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Humphreys; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2131) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Van Treese; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2132) granting a pension to Amanda Napier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2133) granting a pension to Margaret Scofield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2134) granting a pension to Lillian LaMotte; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2135) granting a pension to Mattie Mayo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2136) granting a pension to Ethel Kapp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2137) granting an increase of pension to Dora Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2138) granting an increase of pension to Mamie F. Presley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNOR of New York: A bill (H. R. 2139) for the relief of Alice Steinhardt; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2140) for the relief of James G. Hardy & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2141) for the relief of Timothy Joseph Long; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2142) for the relief of Carlo Scarabello; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2143) for the relief of Emil Chalupa; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2144) for the relief of Henrietta Jacobs; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2145) for the relief of Max Geissler; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2146) extending the provisions of an act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes', approved May 22, 1920, and acts in amendment thereof", to Lucy A. Weaver; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. O'MALLEY: A bill (H. R. 2147) providing for the advancement in rank of Frederick L. Caudle on the retired list of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida: A bill (H. R. 2148) for the relief of Peter C. Hains, Jr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2149) for the relief of Capt. Guy L. Hartman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2150) for the relief of George T. Stonebraker; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2151) granting a pension to Bertha C. Laux; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2152) granting a pension to Frederick Joseph Trott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2153) granting a pension to Vonnice D. Bright; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2154) granting a pension to William F. Clohessy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2155) granting a pension to Joseph M. White; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2156) granting a pension to Margaret E. Giebelhouse; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2157) granting a pension to Frances S. Carney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2158) granting a pension to Harry J. Simpson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2159) granting a pension to Millard Mitchell Sapp; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2160) authorizing the payment of an indemnity to the Spanish Government on account of the death of Juan Neira, a Spanish subject, killed at Savannah, Ga., by a United States truck; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2161) for the relief of George Tatum; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2162) for the relief of Nellie S. Barbee; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2163) for the relief of the heirs of Sarah P. Nix; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2164) for the relief of John A. McGloin; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2165) to permanently renew patent no. 630352; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2166) for the relief of the heirs of Asbury Hodges, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2167) for the relief of I. I. Foss; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2168) for the relief of E. M. Thorpe; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2169) for the relief of H. H. Barnhill; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2170) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. W. L. Davis; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2171) for the relief of Frank Burgess Bruce; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2172) for the relief of the heirs of A. F. Mira; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2173) for the relief of Fritz Dantzler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2174) for the relief of John Henry Mobley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2175) for the relief of Bridger J. Wise; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2176) for the relief of V. Jackson Hodges; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2177) for the relief of Gus Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: A bill (H. R. 2178) for the relief of widows of certain Reserve officers of the Army who died while serving with the Civilian Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2179) granting a pension to Clara L. Garvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANDOLPH: A bill (H. R. 2180) for the relief of Lily Singleton Osburn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 2181) for the relief of James Dewey Powell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2182) for the relief of Mrs. Pink Eller; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2183) for the relief of Earl G. Stout; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2184) for the relief of Clayetta Brownlow Cannon; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2185) granting a pension to William McKinley Green; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2186) granting an increase of pension to Lee Street; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2187) for the relief of Robert E. Wilson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2188) for the relief of Marion C. Asbury; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2189) for the relief of Joy Montgomery; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2190) for the relief of Solon P. Haun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2191) for the relief of Roberta Carr; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2192) for the relief of Paul and A. B. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2193) for the relief of John Ruston; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2194) granting a pension to Guy E. Bolton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTSON: A bill (H. R. 2195) for the relief of Oliver Z. Hoge; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 2196) to refund income and profit taxes erroneously collected on storage batteries; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHANNON: A bill (H. R. 2197) granting a pension to James Joseph Monahan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2198) granting a pension to Jesse E. Lampkin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2199) granting a pension to Joseph Ladish; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2200) granting a pension to Katie Cummings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2201) granting a pension to Charles Arthur Collins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2202) granting a pension to Levi Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2203) for the relief of Mike Prkovich; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2204) for the relief of George W. Wormington; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2205) granting a pension to George W. Wormington; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2206) granting a pension to Hattie M. Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2207) granting a pension to Salina Jane Slaughter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2208) granting a pension to Edward A. Price; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2209) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Massey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2210) for the relief of George Mullens; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2211) for the relief of William George O'Neal; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2212) for the relief of Dory Cleo Arnold; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2213) for the relief of Carl A. Barzen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2214) for the relief of Albert P. Dunbar; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2215) for the relief of Gallup's, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2216) for the relief of John F. Carlow; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2217) for the relief of Charles Cubberly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2218) for the relief of Helen Marie Lewis; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2219) for the relief of Hugh G. Morris; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2220) for the relief of Joseph W. Zorn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 2221) granting a pension to Hiram M. Graves; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2222) granting a pension to Clellia S. Irvin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2223) for the relief of Walter B. Johnson and others; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2224) for the relief of M. E. Parmlee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2225) for the relief of Paul Burrell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2226) for the relief of Leah Levine; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2227) for the relief of Mrs. Avery McDaniel; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2228) for the relief of Thomas Green; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2229) for the relief of Florida O. McLain, widow of Calvin E. McLain, who died from injuries received by being struck by a Government Civilian Conservation Corps truck in the city of Knoxville, Tenn., on August 23, 1934; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2230) for the relief of Willie Brackett; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2231) for the relief of Charles E. Black; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. GUYER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 92) for the relief of William K. Richardson; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

12. Mr. CULLEN presented a petition of the Medical Society of the county of Kings and Academy of Medicine of Brooklyn, urging Congress to appropriate annually to the Army Medical Library an adequate sum for current medical books and periodicals and an additional sum annually for the purchase of back publications lost during recent years; also an annual appropriation to defray the cost of printing regularly each year not less than one volume of the Index Catalogue, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 8, 1937

(Legislative day of Wednesday, Jan. 6, 1937)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THEODORE G. BILBO, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, and BURTON K. WHEELER, a Senator from the State of Montana, appeared in their seats today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, January 6, 1937, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.